

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_125501
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of BxN Hybrids for Fodder Productivity in South Gujarat, India
Type of the Article	Research

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript provides critical insights into high-yielding Bajra x Napier hybrids for sustainable fodder production, offering practical applications for livestock farming in Gujarat and can guide farmers in selecting the most effective hybrids. Its robust analysis makes it valuable for advancing agricultural practices.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	<p>Yes, Suggestions:</p> <p>Contextual Clarity: Briefly mention the importance of fodder yield and quality in the context of sustainable livestock farming at the beginning. This can help set the stage for why the study is relevant.</p> <p>Condense Details: The specific measurements (e.g., plant height, tillers per plant) are important, but the abstract can be more concise by summarizing these results rather than listing all figures. For instance, you could say, "BNH-11 showed superior performance in growth, yield, and protein content."</p> <p>Keywords: Ensure that the keywords cover all key aspects of the study. Consider adding terms like "fodder yield," "sustainable livestock farming," and "irrigated conditions."</p>	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<p>No,</p> <p>Materials and Methods: Suggestion: Ensure that the experimental design (RBD) & Micro-Kjeldahl method for protein estimation are fully explained for clarity of the experimental data. Additionally, detailing any statistical tools used beyond ANOVA would be helpful for replicability. Expand KVK at first or else mention the abbreviation after Krishi Vigyan Kendra in the abstract section.</p> <p>Tables: Ensure all tables are properly referenced in the text for clarity (Table 2). Including brief descriptions for tables would help readers understand the data quickly.</p>	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound as it is based on a well-structured field experiment conducted over three years, allowing for comprehensive data collection and analysis. The use of a Randomized Block Design (RBD) with multiple replications ensures the reliability and validity of the results by minimizing experimental error. The study employs established protocols, such as the Micro-Kjeldahl method for protein estimation, which demonstrates adherence to standard scientific procedures. Furthermore, the statistical analysis using ANOVA enhances the credibility of the findings by providing a rigorous method for evaluating the differences among hybrids under various growth parameters.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	No, Gardner, F. P., Pearce, R. B. and Mitchell, R. L. (1985). Physiology of Crop Plants. The Iowa University Press, 327p. It is an old data.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, but minor revision and proofreading is required	
Optional/General comments	Errors in Reference formats please revise it.	

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Pooja Ranee Behuria
Department, University & Country	University Institute of Agricultural Sciences, Chandigarh University, India