

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_129726
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Azolla (Azolla pinnata) Feeding on Cow Milk Production
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

### Review Form 3

#### PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	Importance of manuscript is reflected on depicting advantages of using Azolla as an alternate forage for cows in the selected area of the research.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	Replace of "effect" by "contribution" is recommended.	
<b>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.</b>	Source of data is lacking. Rest are okay.	
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	It is recommended to elaborate the sourced of data. Variables of study is well incorporated. Which statistical tools and tests are applied to obtain the result and how result is obtained are required to mention. Other descriptions are correct. Sources of Tables in the manuscript are lacking, whether they are author's own calculation or they are different. It is recommended to avoid first person in the descriptions. Table -3 needs to be elaborated. Conclusions are okay. Some policy implications should be added.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	No problems with the references.	
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Minor improvements in grammar and Table- or table should be written in uniform manner throughout the manuscript.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Satisfied with the contents.	

#### PART 2:

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

#### Reviewer Details:

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Sanjoy Kumar Karna</b>
<b>Department, University &amp; Country</b>	<b>Tribhuvan University, Nepal</b>