



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2015_AJEA_17264
Title of the Manuscript:	PERFORMANCE OF GROWING GRASSCUTTERS FED A CONCENTRATE DIET WITHOUT SUPPLEMENTATION WITH FORAGE
Type of the Article	Original Research 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	Introduction. OK. Materials and Methods: 2.1. The experimental diet was formulated to supply 23.00% crude protein or 16% crude protein??? Lines 72 and 76. It is not clear. Tables 3 and 4. Add Reference: SEM – Standard Error of Mean Results. OK. Discussion and Conclusion. OK.	Corrected to 23% crude protein. Corrected. Done. Thank you. Thank you.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	In the Bibliography you must cite according to the "Rules of Writing Magazine." Some names of journals are abbreviated and others are not. You should unify criteria (e.g. compare reference 7 and 10).	Done.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<i>This paper reports many interesting observations: "...concluded that the performance of growing grasscutters fed a concentrate diet without forage is superior to the performance of growing grasscutters fed a concentrate diet with forage."</i> <i>Some corrections should be done on the content.</i>	Done.