**Problem and justification**: The authors, Alary et al (2011), described the problem which the paper addresses and gave the background/motivation to the study. In the paper, *Livestock’s Contribution to Poverty Alleviation: How to Measure It*?, they indicated, statistically, that there are about 987 million poor people in the world that depend on livestock for their livelihoods; with an estimated 397 million poor livestock keepers out of which about 162 million live in Sub-Saharan Africa. According to them, although livestock has been contributing to food and income security worldwide; and also has a potential of making those who depend on it to be financially stable, the sector have been neglected and little or no importance is attached to the livestock sector in the poverty reduction strategies at the national levels. Thus, the aim of the paper was to compare the contribution livestock can give to reduce poverty by using different methods starting with the most common measure-based approaches or financial approaches.

**Questions:** Some research questions clearly presented in the paper and are clearly understood. Some of the questions included:

1. What makes livestock raising a different activity in the accumulation process—and thus in reducing poverty—from crops?
2. Why would prices be less pertinent than in a cropping system?
3. The concept of income is fairly comprehensive, including income received in kind as well as in cash, why is it not suitable for livestock?

**Methods:** Office du Niger, an area located in the inner Delta of the Niger River, is the main study area; and the samples collected were done in two villages that were selected in four distinct locations which have different rural livelihood patterns and access to irrigation; the socio-economic links with the irrigated zone where the fields and villages included in the survey were selected on the basis of two criteria: the representativeness of rural livelihood patterns and prevailing agro-ecological conditions. No succinct methodology was stated by the authors but based on what has been presented, I can safely state that a quantitative methodology was employed with some elements of qualitative analyses. They, however indicated that they used an income-based approach to analyze the relative contribution of each activity to family income (an approach used in the ALive tool developed by CIRAD).

**Results**: Analysing the results of the study presented by the paper, I can say that the key results of the paper were understood and captured by the presenter.

Some of the results presented by the papers are:

1. As indicated in Table 1 of the Results section of the paper the author(s) stated that the average family is large with 2.6 households per farm and 14.6 individuals present on the farm in the study area (in comparison to a national average of 1.7 households and 11.1 individuals present on the farm). Also, polygamy is more common in mixed, irrigated and pastoral systems, involving more than 20% of households (with 35% in the mixed zone) in the study area with the dominant livestock being cattle.
2. Table 2 indicated that with the exception of the irrigated area, the contribution of livestock to reaching the poverty line was significant in all systems, contributing from 9% in mixed systems to over 33% in pastoral systems.
3. With table 3 it is seen that there are some similarities in borrowing and lending capacity relative to capital for all livestock systems except mixed livestock/cropping systems.
4. Two-thirds of the systems were below the poverty line, representing between 55% and 70% of the poverty line for the rainfed and pastoral systems and up to 122% and 151% for the mixed and irrigated systems.
5. The majority of farmers in all the systems said they wished to increase the size of their herd in the next 10 years with table 4 indicating that the pastoral system could improve farmers’ livelihood through a stage of accumulation over 10 years in the absence of climatic problems such as drought or flood.
6. Although the livestock activity reduces food insecurity and human vulnerability, it contributes little to improving living conditions due to the fairly regular use of this capital and to the low rates of biological turnover.

**Conclusion:** I correctly understood the conclusions and implications interpreted.

**Limitations:** the presenter identified the results reveals the limits of the income-based approach to capture all the logics of investment in animals in both the short and long term.

**Contribution of paper**: the findings discussed in the paper were not in the context of the broader literature (although references were made to some few literature) but related to data collected for the research.

**Follow-up research**: the presenter has not identified areas where follow-up research could be conducted.

**Overall impression:** The paper paints a very vivid picture of how a pastoral environment is and the challenges that the parties involved in the livestock production face as well as suggested ways to help improve the livelihood of the stakeholders. Although the research was based on a scanty area, Office du Niger, it seeks to represent other rural and pastoral areas across the globe indicating their lifestyle, livelihood and what can be improved.