



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_46295
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysis of backyard chicken farmers socio-economic and management practices in District Quetta, Balochistan
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
--	---------------------------	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Abstract: -Line 1-..... significantly contribute as a prime.....: Improve -Lines 3 & 4-..... While their production is used for poverty alleviation and efficient transforming feed protein and energy in to consumable human diets. Improve -Line 6-..... regarding these birds..... Write in full -Methodology-data was..... It should be: ...data were..... -Line 15-.....75% were headed households.....What do you mean? -Line 16-..... family size of 58% respondents ranged from 10–20 members. Improve on the statement. How do you define a family in the study area? Poultry population structure: “.....71% of the flock comprised of adult hen, 15% cocks and 14% chicks, respectively” is doubtful. The proportion of chicks could be more. -Line 17-Majority (90%) of the farmer..... Improve. It is ‘farmers’ and not ‘farmer’. -Conclusion- The relationship between the results and the conclusions is not clear</p> <p>MAIN TEXT Line 8-.... biologically value as compared..... Improve Line 15-..... of a large majority of rural families....Improve</p> <p>.....House wives (79%) were the major group involved in poultry farming which was followed by teachers (16%) and health workers (5%). Noticeable majority (79%) of the respondents were rearing backyard poultry as main occupation whereas the rest (21%) were rearing backyard poultry as subsidiary: In this case, does it not therefore imply that poultry is a main enterprise among the residents, and no longer a backyard activity?</p> <p>Although the focus of the study is good, the document has major language issues, requiring correction before publishing. The conclusions and recommendations require further attention by the author</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Done as proposed. • Done as proposed. • Done as proposed. • Done as proposed. • Done as proposed. • Done as proposed. • Done as proposed. • Done as proposed. • Done as proposed. • Done as proposed.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	