

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Biotechnology Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJI_121256
Title of the Manuscript:	Begait sheep production systems and breeding practices of smallholder farmers in Tigrai, Ethiopia
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Considering the importance of small ruminants and their role in the supply of red meat in developing countries, a study in this regard can play a significant role in improving performance. In addition, this research discusses livestock dispersion in two important regions of Ethiopia, but unfortunately, the content was not continuous. If it could be done with a suitable process, the role of breed could be investigated more thoroughly.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	In my opinion, the title of the article could be more comprehensive. However, I think the content could be presented in two articles with distinct topics.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	In my opinion, it was part of the abstract and served as a general conclusion, but it could have been written better. For example, the sentence: "Color, body size, facial profile, libido, and tail size were the most frequently reported traits in selecting breeding Begait rams across the two districts; whereas milk yield, body size, tail size, and facial profile were mentioned as traits given due emphasis in selecting future Begait breeding ewes."	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No, unfortunately, it did not have the right connection. In addition, the examination section of the intended race was too broad	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Examining native breeds and methods to enhance their performance can contribute to sustainable production while strengthening their production potential. Therefore, conducting such studies can play a crucial role in initiating more specialized research. The choice of this topic was excellent and appropriate, but it requires more precise and professional writing.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes. The references were ok and enough. Although it was better comparisons and a more comprehensive discussion were made	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	In general, it was good in terms of English writing, but it needs to be improved to become a strong and effective text.	
Optional/General comments	In general, the materials and methods section needs further improvement, especially in the statistical calculations and accurate data collection. Additionally, the review of the second part of the article is too long, and the lack of proper continuity between the two parts makes the reader impatient.	

Review Form 3

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Abolfazl Mahnani
Department, University & Country	Isfahan University of Technology, Iran