



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAF_50793
Title of the Manuscript:	The Comparative Daily Activity Patterns of Dog Faced Baboon (Papio anubis) in Captivity: A Case Study of the University Zoo and Kano Zoological Garden
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>Abstract: This study compared (not compare) But more importantly you did not compare anything. You described activity there are no comparisons made.</p> <p>Use scientific name once in abstract and once in main article and then just use common name.</p> <p>Do no start a sentence with a digit.</p> <p>What time is morning to afternoon?</p> <p>Introduction:</p> <p>21-47. This is a captive study, yet you do not talk about captive studies and how they relate to wild studies.</p> <p>46. The last sentence should be moved up to the last sentence of the previous paragraph (you can't have a one sentence paragraph). Also remove "carryout" from the last sentence.</p> <p>Study Area:</p> <p>52-58. This is entirely lacking....</p> <p>What is the size of the pen? 362 km2—doubtful sounds like the entire zoo What is in the pen for habitat? How many baboons occur in the pen? What was the weather during the study period?</p> <p>Data collection</p> <p>63. December 2016 to January 2017? 64-66. This section lacks detail. And the study lacks rigor. Three times a week for 20 minutes, so 1-hour total and maybe 7 hours of total observations. This is nowhere near enough to say anything.</p> <p>Was it one focal animal per 20 minutes. Was each animal done for 20 minutes or just one animal? Not clear at all. Did you record every activity for 20 minutes? Usually you record every 10 seconds.</p> <p>66. What is extremely low?</p> <p>Data analysis</p> <p>87-88. What anovas? There are no results described and not sure how you would do this anyway based on your data.</p> <p>What about results by age and sex? Are these all in the same troop? What size is the troop or are they loners?</p>	All correction pointed out have been done.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Results and Discussion</p> <p>93, 106-107. Do not write “..results are presented in Table ..” Just incorporate the table reference into the next sentence.</p> <p>Table 1. What time is morning, afternoon, and evening? What are these frequencies?</p> <p>Still unclear if these are multiple animals.</p> <p>161-162. So, this leads me to believe you had only 1 female observed.</p> <p>239. You do not present data to show the short duration. It would be good to show sequencing in the results.</p> <p>189. How many visitors each year?</p> <p>238. What new finding do you discover? Why is this important?</p> <p>Sample size is too small.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>Details of paper are vague. Not a well-designed study. Overall it lacks rigor and is technically unsound. Sorry, I do not have more positive feedback.</p>	

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>	