

# Review of: "Economics of Cattle Fattening - A Case of Bangladesh"

Leonardo Sartori Menegatto<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Hospital das Clínicas da Faculdade de Medicina da Universidade de São Paulo

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

1. The article is relevant and, although I am not specialist in Economics, it seems to be well prepared in the journal scope. There is a robust analysis of market dynamics, with several qualitative variables and consistent exploratory analysis.
2. The Abstract is sufficiently structured, but presents some divergences from the dynamics of the bibliographic review. This issue occurs, in my opinion, not due to problems in the Abstract, but rather in the bibliographic review.
3. The Abstract begins with greater emphasis on Eid-UI-Azha than the text itself.
4. It would be interesting if the keywords were in alphabetical order.
5. The references do not follow a defined standard, as is mandatory for the journal, and few are from scientific articles published in well-known journals, with those relevant to the area or updated over time being even fewer. Additionally, there are problems as illustrated by the citation from a 1998 thesis and not the article.
6. The paragraphs are long and there are truncated texts, including in the Abstract. This issue is highlighted in the Introduction and Review of Literature.
7. The beginning of the Introduction is long and does not take long to present the problem, and it could be completely suppressed.
8. In the Introduction, check the extensive use of the word "poor" and rewrite sentences such as "large ruminants are cattle and buffalo and small ruminants are sheep and goats constitutive the major proportion of livestock".
9. The goals were presented vaguely and, although obvious from the context, had to expressly mention Bangladesh.
10. The presentation of the organization of the rest of the article at the end of the Introduction is definitely unusual and gives it an informal character.
11. The beginning of the Review of Literature is speculative, lacks sources and attributes credit to the work itself that is superior to that actually carried out. I would suppress the first three periods.
12. The references cited in the Review of Literature are largely outdated, with the most recent ones dating back at least 10 years (!) and many dating back 20 years. In addition to being poorly updated, this framework weakens the idea that no work of this kind was carried out.
13. The Review of Literature citations from other countries are poorly linked to each other and there are very truncated texts, with short periods.
14. In Material and Methods, there is a need to carry out the representativeness/location of the districts.
15. At the end of the Data session, the information portals could be better specified.

16. The multivariate regression analysis presented in "Factors affecting profitability" of Results and Discussion should be better detailed in the Material and Methods.
17. Despite the quantity and quality in the analysis of variables, some comparative significance tests could have been carried out by groups (regions, sexes, etc.) in addition to simply exploratory data analysis.
18. The results presented in the item "Farmer's socioeconomic characteristics" are interesting and a highlight for a discussion.
19. The first period of the conclusion has no function and should be deleted
20. The question of the difference between cattle fattening around the year or before the Eid-UI-Azha could be better explored.
21. The construction of the conclusion is coherent, but directly reflected from the results without robust discussion.
22. Both Conclusion and Results and Discussion presented little actual discussion, i.e. critical analysis of the results. The number of variables presented ended up causing an excessively descriptive text.