



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_14281
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of Lactic Bacteria over the Microbiological Quality of Silage
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. The general standard of English throughout the manuscript needs considerable improvement. 2. There are numerous published papers relating to the ensilage of grass that have not been included in this review. 3. p13-16: There are many more relevant published papers than cited here. A relevant literature review needs to be quite comprehensive.	We seek to review and improve the text in general, because the appraiser was not punctual. We believe that the works cited are current, however, insert more information.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. The title is too general. It needs to indicate that the manuscript focusses on how added LAB inhibit specific undesirable micro-organisms found in forage silage. 2. A clear distinction needs to be provided in all examples as to what type/form of LAB are being discussed. Note that LAB such as <i>L.plantarum</i> are facultative heterofermenters. In most of the examples where (obligative) heterofermentative LAB are being discussed it should be specifically noted that it is <i>L.buchneri</i>. 3. L135: There are many situations where inoculation with LAB will be ineffective – there are published examples of where herbage WSC concentration was too low and/or buffering capacity too high, and where both negative control and LAB inoculated silages preserved quite unsatisfactorily. This likely means that inhibition of, for example, enterobacteria is greatly limited. 4. L213-215: Crude protein = N x 6.25. Thus, crude protein concentration increases either by 'addition of N' or proportionately greater loss of non-N constituents. The latter is the only logical explanation	We seek to serve requests.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	for the findings discussed, even though the scale of effect is quite small. 5. Table 5 – title: Don't understand what this means. 6. L288-291: These statements need to be supported by referencing published literature. There are many experiments that show that herbage sugar content per se does not empower aerobic fungal activity (i.e. some bacterial fermentation products can be equally easily used. 7. L312: It is specifically heterogenous LAB.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		