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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	It is not understood how did you analyzed the effect of the presentation form of the food (Pelleted and mash). This should be contemplated for each evaluated variables, you only mention that the time of ingestion was different between both forms. The discussion is very poor, considering that there are many studies that evaluate ruminants feeding behaviour. In fact 7 of the 11 papers cited are Brazilian. I attached some papers for you, I hope it will help you. Chemical composition analysis of feed need to be described. I send some detailed observations within the manuscript.	
Minor REVISION comments	All variables need to be explained even briefly to the correctly understanding of manuscript. For example: what's efficiency of feeding? DM g/minute? The abbreviation used excessively and that complicates the understanding also should check that there are several abbreviations that do not correspond between the text and tables. It would be useful to add intake levels. In tables, scripts means you have not analyzed or that a significant effect was not found? Add values.	

SDI Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments	The subject is within the scope of the journal. However, after revising the manuscript, my opinion is that it has major problems that you will have to consider to make it suitable for publication. In general the manuscript is poorly written and all items need to be improved. Also, references should be checked. I send some detailed observations that I hope will help the authors.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Anonymous**
Department, University & Country	**Uruguay**