

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_109237</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Exploring the impact of varying nitrogen levels and cutting management on fodder yield and nutritional quality in fodder pearl millet (<i>Pennisetum glaucum</i> L.)</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Research article</b>

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>The manuscript is important for the scientific community, but more so for the region. Although its importance can be highlighted and established within the article. Clarify in the summary and in the methodology where the study is, because it is confusing. This article should be compared with other international studies and its writing should be strengthened, as it is deficient and short. It must be delved a little deeper. There are more references missing and they must be cited well and placed appropriately at the end of the article, according to the instructions in the guide for authors. The title is appropriate. The first part of the summary is not understood. The subsections are adequate, but the statistical analysis, which is key in this type of study, is missing. The article is scientifically correct, but the writing needs to be improved and the standard deviation of the results obtained must be reported. The references are not sufficient or updated. More suggestions to improve the article are seen in the text.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language needs to be revised.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Sandra Patricia Chaparro Acuña</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universidad Pedagógica y Tecnológica de Colombia, Colombia</b>