



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_13891
Title of the Manuscript:	Correlation between intake and feeding behavior of Holstein calves supplemented with pelleted and mash
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	If I understood correctly the aim of the present study was to find behavioural measures, which can replace more complicated and expensive food intake measurements in order to estimate the consumption of the animals. In its present form the purpose of the study is rather superficial, try to be more concrete. Methods: The authors stated that “Experimental design was used in units of repeated measures, in 2x2 factorial design” The statistical analysis should be done accordingly and not only correlation should be analyzed. Results: it was hard to follow. Try to reorder the data and give some possible utility of the outcome. P7 l 132 introduced an abbreviation, but in the Table 4 other abbreviations were used (presumably with the same meaning). Table 5 is especially confusing. How can EffeDM correlate to DM? How was the efficacy of feeding calculated? Give the full meaning of the abbreviation on first appearance. It would be nice to read some more about DMI, NDF and ADF and their possible connections in the introduction. p10 l188-194 These ideas belong to Conclusions.	All alterations carried out directly in the article as requested and are highlighted and yellow
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Abstract: give explanation to NDF, ADF, TPO p4 l72 delete second “available” P5 l90 give the meaning of the abbreviations P7 l 141-142 cite Table 4. instead of Table 5.	corrected as requested



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The experiments described in the present paper might have potential economical and research value. However, it was hard to pick up the information, therefore major revision of the paper is required.	
---	--	--