



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Animal and Veterinary Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAVS_47840
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF ETHNO-VETERINARY PRACTICES AMONG CATTLE HERDERS IN ZURU, KEBBI STATE, NIGERIA
Type of the Article	<u>Original Research Article</u>

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	<p>Table 3 is confusing to me. The frequency of disease treated segment is 110 and also the number of herdsmen are 110. Its means that every herdsman has treated only single disease with ethno-botanical knowledge. However it is not realistic that a herdsman just treat a single disease with ethno-botanical knowledge.</p> <p>Lines 131-134: it is stated "The result from Table 4 revealed 19.09% dermatolphylosis, 17.27% parasitic problems, 16.36% Contagious Bovine Pleuropneumonia, 11.82% diarrhea and 12.72% trypanosomiasis respectively as the major disease problems treated using the knowledge of ethno-botanical practices and plants available in the study area" This data is presented in table 3 not table 4.</p> <p>How the herdsmen get those plants. Whether they collect by themselves or they purchase?</p> <p>Why majority of the herdsmen use ethno-botanical practices? Orthodox medicine facilities are unavailable, ineffective or expensive?</p>	<p>Corrected (The diseases treated data was in multiple response)</p> <p>Corrected</p> <p>Corrected (lines 133-134)</p> <p>Explained in lines 142-143</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)	No