

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_104482
Title of the Manuscript:	Exploring the Nutritional Landscape: A review of Fodder options for Livestock
Type of the Article	Review 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.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Understanding the concept of selection in the field of fodder plant propagation and breeding is defensible based on the inputs and existing conditions, but the author has not presented this issue correctly. S</p> <p>2. The title of the article is not appropriate, it is suggested to change the title to "".</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article is presented very briefly and the elements are not identified in it.</p> <p>4. The content is excessive and it is better to revise its presentation and writing.</p> <p>5. The scientific principles of this article are acceptable, but the author has presented voluminous content that bores the audience.</p> <p>6. The number of sources is proportional due to the high volume of content, but considering that the content presented in this article is excessive and needs to be revised; its amount should be reduced and updated in terms of time.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English quality of the article is suitable for scientific communication.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mohammad Reza Zargaran Khouzani
Department, University & Country	Khuzestan University of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources, Iran