

# Review of: "Unravelling The Contributions Of The Nigerian Livestock And Other More Prominent Sectors In Mitigation Of Global Green House Gas (GHG)"

Taitiya Yuguda

**Potential competing interests:** The author(s) declared that no potential competing interests exist.

While it is important to Unravel the Contributions of The Nigerian Livestock and Other More Prominent Sectors in Mitigation of Global Green House Gas emissions, towards achieving the UN sustainable development goals, this article has some significant limitations.

After an introduction, a common practice in scientific articles, which of course you are aware of, is to review all the efforts that have been made in the field you are studying. Then or during this review, their strengths and weaknesses could be examined and the necessity of conducting current research, In order to improve and develop those previous studies, can be explained. Then it's time to describe your method, here you must clearly define your method by mentioning its advantages and innovations compared to previous works, so that any other person can reach your results by repeating that method and be able to verify the accuracy of your results. In the following, it is time to present the results and achievements and finally to summarize.

I did not find your method for solving the problem in a straightforward and coherent way, neither was there a method section, despite the numerous cases of tables depicting multiple numbers and percentages, various references etc. Obviously, a lack of hypothesis and methodology makes this work look like a report. Here are some specific comments.

1. Since GHG has benefits and detriments, perhaps you could add "emissions" to the article title.
2. The abstract is somewhat fragmented and having bullet points. Is this the journal format?
3. The study aimed at evaluating the contribution of the Nigerian's livestock to global GHG emission. What scientific method, model or metric did you use to arrive at your synthesis? Is this an article or a review or a report? Its seems like you just sourced some information from the internet and combined them.
4. No research challenges and recommendations for further study
5. Honestly this (article or report) is unscientific as it lacks structure and coherence, making it difficult to comprehend. Perhaps it fits the journals aim and scope, this is just my humble opinion.