Journal Name:	Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JAERI_64310**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Animal production, resource engagement and sustainability of return**
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:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/editorial-policy)

SDI 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	**Abstract** It has been written just like introduction. The significant findings and conclusion must be written in abstract. **introduction** The objective of the work must be included in the introduction. **Material and methods.** Staticial analysis should be checked as suggested in text. apply post hoc analysis/ pair wise comparisons for different age groups. Or pair wise tets use benforini correction. **Resuts and discussion** What is difference between completly disagree and disagree.? What is the difference between partially disagree and partially agree? Wrtie only salient points from the data in table. Donot write every detail which is already in table. The statements in table and text do not match . in test there mention of the year but not in table. Rather than writing full staements every time, it will be better to write the statements in material and methods and then code or number them. Then the writing and understanding of results section will become easy. Tables 8-12 may be combined. Unfortunately the reults have not been discussed. The results should be discussed in light of previos references. I have not checked the references. Also i have not checked the conclusions as there is no discussion.	
Minor REVISION comments		
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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20