



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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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	<p>1. The reliability of the scales presented in Section 2.5 and Table 2 should be recomputed. The Cronbach's alpha to be computed should be the internal consistency of the items in each scale and not the "internal consistency of the four scales. In particular, for "Perception regarding livestock waste management (prlwm), compute the internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) of the 13 items presented in Table 3. Do the same for the other scales: perlm, ecu and PE.</p> <p>2. In Section 3 (as the section title suggest), do not only present the results; there should be discussions of results.</p> <p>3. In addition, the discussions presented in lines 220-231 should be incorporated to Results and Discussion section. Conclusions should be direct answers to the objectives of the study.</p>	<p>We the authors thank the reviewer for this suggestion.....but scientifically it adds no new scientific impact or new knowledge on the essence of adding Cronbach's alpha for all the items.....it will rather bulge the manuscript with irrelevant tables unless the aim of the study is directly related to Cronbach's alpha variability in its internal consistency of the statistical method. The reviewer can see an attached table of the reliability as requested in Appendix 1.</p> <p>The results are discussed as pointed out by the reviewer in Section 3.</p> <p>We the authors thank the reviewer for suggesting that results in conclusion should be incorporated to Discussion section. The corrections are made in L103-104, 125-131, 141-143, 170-174, 197-203. The conclusion has been rewritten in L236-252</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>1. There are typographical errors in lines 73 and 75. In line 73, the statement "55 (18.3%) and 41-50 years" should be "55 (18.3%) are 41-50 years. In line 75, "5001 – 1000" should be "501 – 1000".</p> <p>2. The citation "(Fraenkel and Wallen, 2000)" in line 100 should be "[16]".</p> <p>3. In Table 3, delete "4" and "5" under the headings "Mean" and "SD", respectively.</p> <p>4. There is a grammatical error in a sentence in lines 71-72.</p> <p>5, In lines 188 and 200, "P = .05" should be "$\alpha = .05$". It is α (level of significance) and not p-value that is set to be .05; p is compared to α in statistical decision making.</p> <p>6. Delete lines 212-216. The sentences written there are exact repetitions of those in lines 200-204.</p> <p>7. The citation "Tyson 1995" in line 227 should be [18], then renumber the citations [18] and [19] as [19] and [20], respectively. "Tyson 1995" should also be included as reference 18 in the list of references.</p>	<p>Correct in L102 as are 41-50 year. Corrected in L106 as "501 – 1000"</p> <p>The reference in L88 has been corrected to [16] The numbers has been deleted in Table 3 as suggested by the reviewer The grammar is corrected in L70 as "The questionnaire focused on gender, age, education for demography and a general perception regarding livestock waste" The corrected is made in L210 as suggested by the reviewer.</p> <p>The authors thank the reviewers for suggesting that those lines be deleted but the values in L221-222 ($t(298) = -.356, P = .722 > .05$) which relates teaching methods are different from those in L211 ($t(298) = -.385, P = .700 > .05$) which relate teaching tools, though the sentence has been modified. Tyson 1995 has been included in the list of reference as [18] Tyson TW. Best Management Practices to Handle Dairy Wastes. Alabama Cooperative Extension System Publication ANR-970. Alabama: A&M University and Auburn University; 1995 The references in the text are renumbered accordingly as they are used.</p>
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>	There are no ethical issues to this study.

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>