



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_48228
Title of the Manuscript:	Perception of Agricultural Students Towards Livestock Waste Management Education in Libya
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Describe sampling procedures and sample size at section 2.2 Section 2.2 of materials and methods which contain figures and tables should go to results Where is discussion of this article? Not clearly seen. Kindly separate results from discussion. In the discussion section, discuss why are the results are the way they are by relating it with other people's similar r closely related findings. This is missing in this article. The conclusion is too long. Just make a summary of your results. Your conclusion sounds like discussion of the results. In conclusion siting the references is not required. 	<p>We the authors thank the reviewer for requesting description of sampling procedures. The sampling procedures are indicated in L69-74</p> <p>This figures and tables have been moved to section 3</p> <p>The authors thank the reviewer for this observation and the results have been compared with other studies for more scientific understanding L103-104, 125-131, 141-143, 170-174, 197-203.</p> <p>The conclusion have been summarized in L236-252</p>
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>