

### Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Scientific Research and Reports.</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JSRR_116638</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>AN OVERVIEW OF THE JOURNEY OF DEVELOPMENT OF ARTIFICIAL INSEMINATION IN LIVESTOCK</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Review Article</b>

#### 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> )

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 1:** Review Comments

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>  <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	1-The paper is a review on the development of AI in domestic animals and aims to provide a general description of how AI developed from the first sparks in 1300s, and integrated into modern animal farming, particularly in India. 2-No. The major part of the paper describes the past events and does not touch recent topics. Application of flowcytometry as an example, is not a recent finding. In my opinion, either the body of the paper must be changed to include more recent findings, or the title of the paper must be changed to better communicate that the paper focuses on the initial stages of AI development and its regional application in India. 3-It can benefit from further improvements. 4- No. The paper is not coherent in terms of the order of materials presented. Subsectioning is required as well. 5- The review paper is rather a historic narration. It does not present much scientific information. 6- No. Much further work is required here.  The text is not coherent. The sub sections are not sufficient. The whole text uses a basic English. Sentences do not convey scientific a tone and facts are stated as personal opinions without proper citation and logical coherence to the rest of the text. Many references are required to be inserted. More details are inseterd in the text for the respected authors attention.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	No. The structure of the English is acceptable, but it does not convey enough scientific tone.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	comments added to the paper's text	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Behnam Asadi
Department, University & Country	Dubai