

Name:	<a href="#"><u>UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY</u></a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_UPJOZ_4309</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Evaluation of replacing concentrate with Mulato II and Greenleaf desmodium (<i>Desmodium intortum</i>) forages on intake, digestibility and growth performance of Farta sheep</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION</b> comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	<b>Working to find alternatives to animal feed that serve the economic aspect of animal production</b>	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	<b>yes</b>	

<p>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>	<p>The summary of the article is comprehensive, with some things added to this section Determine the number of groups and name them writing and stating conclusions</p>	<p>Dear reviewer, we appreciate your wonderful remarks on the manuscript. Below, our responses are presented as per the comments suggested. We have added <b>Reviewer's comment</b> 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><b>Reviewer's comment:</b> Determine the number of groups and name them writing and stating conclusions.</p> <p><b>Authors' response:</b> This study has only one factor (replacing level) since the forages (Mulato II and <i>D. intortum</i>) were offered as a mixture at different replacing levels. Thus, we have already mentioned the factor (replacing level) and stated the conclusion in the abstract.</p> <p><b>Reviewer's comment:</b> You have two factors 1. Type of forage 2. Replacing level</p> <p><b>Authors' Response:</b> The study has only one factor, replacing level. Though, we have two forage types (grass –Mulato II and Legume- <i>D. intortum</i>), those forages were mixed at a ratio of 3:7, respectively. The forage mix was offered at different replacing levels (0, 20, 40, 60, and 80%) to substitute the concentrate. Further, we have clearly stated it in the methodology part as well as in the abstract.</p>
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>yes</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this</p>	<p>Regarding the scientific validity of this manuscript. I believe that this manuscript is not scientifically robust and technically sound because the statistical</p>	<p><b>Reviewer's comment:</b> I believe that this manuscript is not scientifically robust and technically sound because the statistical method</p>

<p>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.</p>	<p>method applied in the manuscript is incomplete.</p>	<p>applied in the manuscript is incomplete.  <b>Author's response:</b> Dear reviewer, we acknowledge your valuable comment on the statistical method applied in the manuscript. As stated from the manuscript, RCBD design was used since we have only one factor (replacing level) and initial body weight to block the sheep. The two forage types (Mulato II and <i>D. intortum</i>) were mixed and offered at different replacing levels. Thus, the data was subjected to analysis of variance (ANOVA) using the general linear model (GLM) procedure of SAS version 9.4. In this regard, the statistical method applied in this study is valid.</p>
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references are sufficient and the percentage of modernity is 65-75%.</p>	

<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language/English quality of the article is appropriate for academic communication</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Public comments</p> <p>The article will be good after making statistical adjustments</p>	<p><b>Reviewer's comment:</b> The article will be good after making statistical adjustments.</p> <p><b>Author's response:</b> As stated above, RCBD design was used since we have only one factor (replacing level) and initial body weight to block the sheep. The two forage types (Mulato II and <i>D. intortum</i>) were mixed and offered at different replacing levels (0, 20, 40, 60, and 80%) to substitute the concentrate. Thus, the data was subjected to analysis of variance (ANOVA) using the general linear model (GLM) procedure of SAS version 9.4. From this perspective, there is no need to adjust the statistical analysis.</p>

## **PART 2:**

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