



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Animal and Veterinary Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAVS_45681
Title of the Manuscript:	HONEY BEE PRODUCTS MARKETING PRACICES: CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES IN AND AROUND MAKSEGNIT TOWN, AMHARA REGION, ETHIOPIA
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/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Abstract cannot contain acronyms - rewrite in full - The introduction has very long paragraphs that make it difficult to read and understand the text. -The map presented in the work is not very explanatory, it needs better resolution, removal of the grids, and more precise identification of the research area - Some citations from the text are not in the references ((Natalia.et al.2014; AMP, 2007; SPSS 20; ACC,2003; Keralem, 2009; Assefa, 2009; Tezara, 2013) - Some references were not cited in the text (CACC, 2003; Ejigu et. al, 2009) - there may have been a typo in the ACC, 2003. - There is a thesis in the references, I do not know to what extent the journal accepts this type of reference (line 256) - 38.5% of references have more than 10 years - Look for more recent works that support the text. - There is no discussion in the first paragraph of the results and discussion, only a comparison of results. It is necessary to speak in the text about the probable reasons that can lead to these results. - The first two paragraphs of the results and discussion are compared with only one paper, comparing with at least two papers is necessary. - The third paragraph on the price of honey can be divided to not make the reading tiresome; there are other works that talk about factors that influence the value of honey that can be used in the discussion. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -A few words are written wrong - lines 28, 130,79 -Sigla SNNPR has no caption - In line 253 the scientific name of the bee is written together and is not with emphasis - Tables 1, 4 and 5 need review to be more presentable - Tessega (2014) is cited 5 times and is a thesis, the use of theses and the repetition of a citation is not recommended more than 3 times, - look for more works that support the text. - Keralem E (2005) is cited 4 times, it is not recommended to repeat the same citation more than 3 times- Look for more works that support the text 	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is interesting to attach the questionnaires as annexes for a better understanding of the applied method. 	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Vagner de Alencar Arnaut de Toledo</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Universidade Estadual de Maringá, Brazil</i>