

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_83801
Title of the Manuscript:	Mobile Device and Software for Automating Body Measurements in Sheep and Goats
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.journaljeai.com/index.php/JEAI/editorial-policy>)

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>Title: the title is misleading as there was no measurement recorded in goats. Suggested title is “comparative study of manual and automated body measuring device in sheep (and goats if goats were measured).</p> <p>Abstract: this portion should briefly describe what the experiment was about by presenting materials and methods, results and conclusion. The first ten lines of the abstract provided no concrete information.</p> <p>Introduction: authors are advised to edit this portion to focus on body measurements in sheep and goats, reason why and how automated measurements are better than manual which is the conventional method adopted by most farmers. It is suggested that section 2.2 on body measurements will add value to the introductory chapter.</p> <p>Materials and methods: this section is very important considering that the article is an original research article. In the present form, there is little or no information on the species of animals used, feed and water intake, sex and physiological status (it is often significant in body measurements), environmental condition of the experimental site etc. Authors are advised to provide more information under this section especially about the experimental animals.</p> <p>Results and discussions: results must be presented in full and properly discussed citing authors who have done similar research. The results in goats are missing from the manuscript. Also, only two authors were cited in the discussion section which may not be enough to properly justify the results.</p> <p>References: the references did not follow the format. It is important to include the journal name, year of publication, pages etc. For instance, the first reference “Barbosa, M., 2014” is missing some important details. Also, “SOWAND, O” is actually spelt “SOWANDE”. Authors are advised to review the references and present a complete version.</p>	<p>Title: Title: With the research, a (own) hardware/software solution was created. Thus, a software patent and registration application was generated with the National Institute of Industrial Property-INPI, as a result of which we decided to leave the title of the article emphasizing the solution. The term goat was removed as requested by the reviewers, since measurements were not performed with goats.Abstract: The first 10 lines were summarized and partially rewritten.</p> <p>Introduction: Part of the introduction has been rewritten taking into account the reviewers' suggestions</p> <p>Materials and methods: A partial rewriting of some subsections was carried out, two subsections was removed, keeping the others that are necessary for the technical understanding of the computational solution and possible reproduction. Information about the animals used in the measurement has been rewritten and is in topic 3.2.1 (in lines 118 and 119)</p> <p>☑</p> <p>Results and discussions : measurements were performed on sheep only. Thus, references to goats were removed from the title and article. Two more works were cited in which measurement occurs manually in the last paragraph of the results and discussions.</p> <p>References: were reviewed</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>There is no need for the section “theoretical reference” in an original research article. This is only important in a review article.</p> <p>Authors should note that the number of pages does not necessarily determine the quality of an article. Kindly remove some of the information that are too general in nature about agriculture and focus more on sheep and goats as it relates to body measurements.</p>	
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?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>No</p>	