

Review of: "Enhancing Veterinary Services for Smallholder Farmers in Zimbabwe: A Comprehensive Literature Review"

Yohannes Asfaw¹

¹ Mekelle University

Potential competing interests: I declare that there is no potential competing interests.

My Feedback on the following manuscript

Qeios ID: 0G67D1 · <https://doi.org/10.32388/0G67D1>, **Manuscript title:** Enhancing Veterinary Services for Smallholder Farmers in Zimbabwe: A Comprehensive Literature Review

Overall impression on the manuscript: The authors reviewed literatures to understand the status of veterinary service delivery and roles of actors. They generated evidences that help to inform the policy-makers and development partners to design smallholder farmer-focused and pro-poor veterinary interventions in the Zimbabwe. With this, I see that the work added new evidences to the existing body of scientific knowledge. Hence, it is insightful work.

Title: The title accurately reflects the content of the manuscript. But as the manuscript title looks like project title. I suggest that the it can be rephrased as “**A Comprehensive Review on Veterinary service provision for smallholder farmers in Zimbabwe**”

Abstract

The abstract is well written and included the important sections, i.e., the background, methods and objective. However, though it is almost complete and stand-alone, I would suggest that the authors need to clearly state the knowledge gap they addressed, key findings of the review and their conclusive remark and recommendations. This could help the abstract to be more accurate and complete.

Introduction

It is well stated. However, the knowledge/evidence-gap that the authors addressed is not well stated in the introduction. Therefore, I suggest that the authors need to clearly state the Problem of statement to help readers understand why this review was conducted. Moreover, the introduction is mixed with the findings of the review and hence it has to be put in a separate section.

Materials and Methods

There is no separate section stating the materials and methods. Hence, as reader may face difficulty of understanding how the review was conducted, what number and type of literatures were consulted, etc., Therefore, **I suggest that the authors** need to clearly state material and methods of the review in separate section. More, the comprehensive review

should be operationally defined. What do the authors mean by comprehensive review? Is it the same as Systematic review or what?

Findings and Discussion and conclusion

The findings of the review are well described and discussed section by section to characterize important components of the veterinary service provision system, in detail and to be very informative.

Conclusion and Recommendation

It well described. However, the recommendation/way forward need to be separately and strongly stated. This will help to policy-makers and readers to easily pick what solution is recommended for which problem.

References: All of the references in the list are properly cited in the body.

Recommendation

- **Accept** with revision of the above indicated comments.