

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>)

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	Rewrite the Material and Methods section again in brief Citation are not code as per journal guideline throughout Ms, Discussion section of the Ms is not written well, rewrite the discussion in references of more previous studies References are not as per journal guideline	The Material and Methods section has been rewritten, making it more streamlined. More references have been added to discussions of previous studies and references have been corrected according to the journal
Minor REVISION comments	Correct all suggestions mentioned in Ms by the reviewer	Suggestions have been met
Optional/General comments	Overall, this is a clear, concise, and well-written manuscript. The introduction is relevant and theory based. Sufficient information about the previous study findings is presented for readers to follow the present study rationale and procedures. The methods are generally too much lengthy. Overall, the discussion is not clear and justify in comparisons of Sufficient number of previous studies. The authors make a systematic contribution to the study in this area of investigation. The longitudinal nature of the work, albeit with college students, is a welcome addition. Overall, this is an average quality manuscript that has implications for the theoretical basis. Ms accepted for publication after suggested correction.	

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)	