

Name:	Uttar Pradesh journal of zoology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_4309
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of replacing concentrate with Mulato II and Greenleaf desmodium (<i>Desmodium intortum</i>) forages on intake, digestibility and growth performance of Farta sheep
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION 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>
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 is important as it studies the use of green feed materials and their replacement with concentrated materials to reduce costs.	Noted
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is appropriate.	Ok thanks
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.	The summary is comprehensive and complete.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	yes	
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.	1- This manuscript discusses the replacement of concentrated materials with green fodder in sheep nutrition 2- Reducing feeding costs 3- Using available fodder materials 4- Bridging the fodder gap 5- Covering the needs of animals	Effected

Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	yes	
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----	--

<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>yes</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The researcher used two types of feed with different chemical composition and addition rate. Each type should have been studied separately. Daily growth rate of sheep is considered an accurate indicator of replacement rate. There is a difference of about 30% between T1 and T5, however statistical analysis did not show any significant differences. How? Recommended to replace up to 60% only</p>	<p>We highly acknowledge and appreciate the reviewer for the constructive comments given on the manuscript. Below, we presented our responses for each comment and the actions we took to correct them. We have added Reviewer's comment immediately before our respective feedbacks for easy of clarity. We highlighted our responses in yellow color both in the corrected manuscript and the authors' feedback file.</p> <p>Reviewer's comment: The researcher used two types of feed with different chemical composition and addition rate. Each type should have been studied separately.</p> <p>Authors' response: In fact, the forages used in this study were grass (Mulato II) and legume (<i>Desmodium intortum</i>), but the forages were mixed at a ratio of 3:7, respectively. In this study, those forages were offered and studied as a mixture, but not separately.</p> <p>Reviewer's comment: Daily growth rate of sheep is considered an accurate indicator of replacement rate.</p> <p>Authors' response: Yet average daily gain (ADG) is also the most common key performance indicator to study the performance of sheep. We have used</p>

		<p>ADG since it measures how much weight the sheep gains per day over a specific period of time. It is also very important to determine the FCE.</p> <p>Reviewer's comment: There is a difference of about 30% between T1 and T5, however statistical analysis did not show any significant differences. How? Recommended to replace up to 60% only.</p> <p>Authors' response: Dear reviewer, the comment is very important and we appreciate you to the deep insight of the work. Actually, we have tried to analyse the data using various software even before the submission of this article to check its significance. However, the ANOVA showed that the result is insignificant in terms of ADG. In this case, we only discussed the result from the statistical point of view, not the numerical values. The insignificant effect of the replacement on the ADG could be due to the nature of the experiment. That is, the aim of this experiment was to investigate the substitution effect of Mulato II and <i>D. intortum</i> mixed forages to concentrate on the performance of sheep. In this regard, the insignificant effect of the replacement could tell us the potential of the forages to substitute the concentrate as an alternative. Further, the forages are locally grown, easily accessible and cost effective for the small holder farmers. As far as the growth performance of the sheep not compromised as shown from the statistical analysis result, it is recommended to replace up to 80%.</p>

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