

**Paper: “Challenges and Opportunities in the Livestock Industry for higher productivity and sustainability: The case of Albania”**

**Submitted: 21 May 2024**

**Accepted: 28 June 2024**

**Published: 31 July 2024**

Corresponding Author: Grisejda Myslimi

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n19p70](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n19p70)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Hamzo Khan Tagar

College Education Department Government of Sindh, Pakistan

Reviewer 2: Blinded

### **ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024**

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision. The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

***ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!***

Reviewer Name: <b>DR HAMZOO KHAN TAGAR</b>	
University/Country: Karachi Pakistan	
Date Manuscript Received: 11/6/2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 12/6/2024
Manuscript Title: <b>Challenges and opportunities in the livestock industry for higher productivity and sustainability – Case of Albania</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: yes	

#### **Evaluation Criteria:**

**Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.**

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>Decent title</b>	
<b>2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments) abstract is clear</i>	

<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments) well written</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments) acceptable</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments) result is valid</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert accurate your comments) accurate and supported</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<i>appropriate</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) : X

Accepted, no revision needed	<b>accepted</b>
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

**Fine article and net addition**