

Review of: "Comparative Analysis of Sustainable Livestock Development as a Source of Livelihood to Farmers of Maharashtra and Jammu and Kashmir"

Adolfo Álvarez-Macías¹

¹ Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The study on livestock problems and prospects in two regions of India is relevant, with valid information and valuable development proposals. However, it is recommended that the problems and objectives of the research be delimited so that it is not a broad diagnosis without a common thread.

Although the working method is implicit, it would be useful to explain the criteria for selecting the type of statistical information and the way it is processed, explaining why the sources of information and statistical tables are not consistent. In fact, the statistical data are analyzed superficially.

It is understood that animal husbandry has a low level of capitalization and productivity, and there is a lack of conclusive evidence: livestock yields, stocking rates, birth rates, fertility, and others. To facilitate the understanding of the low productivity that is repeatedly mentioned, "livestock yields, stocking rates, birth rates, fertility, and others" should be specified.

The livestock analyzed has characteristics similar to those of many developing countries, but no evidence is presented, nor are comparisons made with livestock in other regions and countries. Emphasis is placed on technological change, but public and private budgets for livestock are scarce in the regions studied, so how can progress be made? It would be important to value the role of cooperatives and self-organizing processes to contribute to a development strategy.

Reference is made to markets and the involvement of global corporations such as Nestlé and Fonterra, for example, but neither channels and commercial margins nor price levels for farmers and consumers are specified. This can be an exclusive model for small producers, which is a very important issue.

The conclusions are interesting, but do not necessarily follow from the evidence presented throughout the manuscript. They include development proposals that seem more like public policy recommendations but lack a common thread that articulates them and gives them meaning in order to truly promote sustainable livestock production that is technologically adapted to local conditions and improves the livelihoods of producers and other actors linked to the livestock production chains in the two regions studied.

