

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_102577
Title of the Manuscript:	NIRS Estimation of the Nutritive Value of Megathyrsus maximus (Syn. Panicum sp.) Forages
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljeai.com/index.php/JEAI/editorial-policy> )

### PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</li> <li>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</li> <li>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</li> <li>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community. Limited NIRS calibrations are available for forages.</p> <p>Yes the title is suitable</p> <p>Suggestion: Indicate the number of replications in the abstract, otherwise it is comprehensive enough.</p> <p>Yes; however, due to limited time given to review the paper adherence to the journal guidelines was not checked in detail but the structure of the manuscript are acceptable according to scientific standards</p> <p>Yes, in my opinion the information in the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>Yes</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</li> </ol>	Language must be edited and revised	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	Follow author guidelines	

### PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Gerbrecht Christina Josling</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of the Free State, South Africa</b>