

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Animal and Veterinary Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAVS_92233
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessing economical livelihood of small-scale city swine farmers using SemPLS: Special Case of Manokwari, West New Guinea Papua
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:

(<https://www.journalajravs.com/index.php/AJRAVS/editorial-policy>)

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	Title: economic, not economical Abstract: please include objective of the study, write in complete correct sentences. Keywords: Must not include words from the title, must be other concepts to increase searchability of the paper Introduction: lyai (2017) not found in the reference Materials & method: please describe basis of picking 60 respondents out of 145 swine farmers Hypothesis: not discussed nor tested in the study Result: since objective is not clearly stated, Results is aimless Conclusion: Does not include results like percentage, must be based on the objectives. References: Jonge (2008) has two entries in the reference, but only one Jonge cited within text, Ternak not used within text, lyai 2017	Title: Revised Abstract: Included objective of the study, write in complete correct sentences. Keywords: Revised Introduction: Deleted. Materials & method: please describe basis of picking 60 respondents out of 145 swine farmers Hypothesis: Assessed based on designed models and output of SemPLS. Result: Objective stated clearly in the last paragraph of introduction. since objective is not clearly stated, Results is aimless Conclusion: Revised. Does not include results like percentage, must be based on the objectives. References: Revised. Jonge (2008) has two entries in the reference, but only one Jonge cited within text, Ternak not used within text, lyai 2017
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Sentences in the Paragraphs lack cohesion. References: Sufficient to establish knowledge of the study	

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)	