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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	Manuscript concerns an important problem - wildlife animal species as an important source of animal protein. Eighteen 10-weeks old male grasscutters were allocated randomly to three treatments were used for the determine the effect of feeding growing grasscutters a concentrate diet without forage Abstract is clear, informative, brief and representative of the work and underlines the significance of the subject. Introduction is understandable, clear and comprehensive exposing the reader to the topic. Purpose and objectives are scientifically appropriate. Introduction is understandable clear and well comprehensive exposing the reader to the topic.. Purpose and objectives are scientifically appropriate. The methods used are aqurate and correctly described. So described they allow experiment to be reproduced. Appropriate statistics was used. The experimental results are thoroughly and logically interpreted in the discussion and presented with clarity. Author (-s) compared the results obtained with the experiments and results of previous studies on the relevant subject. The findings are particularly valuable having in a mind importance for he convenience of grasscutter farmers.	

SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	However, some minor errors were noted: line 38 – grasscuttter should be grasscutter line 107 the temperature range 226 – 29ºC must be 26-29 ºC line 155 (P=0.05) according to Guideline for Reporting *P* values must be (P= .05); the same goes for line 183 In the text between parameters and its values (without percent - %) must be have distance. for example: line 162 239.90 g/day, instead 239.90g/day In section "Results and discussion" are given only 5 authors. I think that the "Discussion" must be strengthened.	Corrected. Corrected. Corrected. Accepted.
Optional/General comments	Organization into sections and subsections was well done and paper structure is clear and arranged according to journal style.	Thank you.