



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_13824
Title of the Manuscript:	CORRELATION BETWEEN INTAKE AND INGESTIVE BEHAVIOR OF CONFINED HOLSTEIN-ZEBU CROSSBRED HEIFERS
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	The author could not specify the control group in the experimental design and in the text. He simply wrote a completely randomized design. Without a defined control group, compares and inferences are impossible.	The elephant grass (<i>Pennisetum purpureum</i> Schum.) Is a grass species with high biomass production, and commonly used for silage production. However, it has high moisture content and insufficient soluble carbohydrates in the vegetative stage, which often results in fermentation of <i>Clostridium</i> (Yahaya et al., 2004). Moreover, its low crude protein (Yunus et al., 2000) and high levels of structural carbohydrates (Zhang et al, 2011.; Bureenok et al., 2012) resultando no baixo valor nutritivo silagem. Given the characteristics of the plant presents, and the necessary conditions in silage production, makes it impossible to be used without any additives. For this reason, not use a control treatment.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Minor corrections as indicated in the text should be effected.	Accepted corrections text as requested References used for the justification Bureenok S, C Yuangklang, K Vasupen, JT Schonewille and Y Kawamoto, 2012. The effects of additives in Napiergrass silages on chemical composition, feed intake, nutrient digestibility and rumen fermentation. Asian-Aust J Anim Sci, 25: 1248-1254. Yahaya MS, M Goto, W Yimiti and Y Kavamoto,



SDI Review Form 1.6

		2004. Evaluation of fermentation quality of a tropical and temperate forage crops ensiled with additives of fermented juice of epiphytic lactic acid bacteria (FJLB). Asian-Aust J Anim Sci, 17: 942-946. Yunus M, N Ohba, M Shimojo, M Furuse and Y Masuda, 2000. Effects of adding urea and molasses on Napiergrass silage quality. Asian-Aust J Anim Sci, 13: 1542-1547. Zhang L, CQ Yu, M Shimojo and T Shao, 2011. Effect of different rates of ethanol additive on fermentation quality of Napiergrass (Pennisetum purpureum). Asian-Aust J Anim Sci, 24: 636-642.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	It is a preliminary research work. More work should be done before you can develop a predictive formular.	Reformulated the conclusion justifying that, because it is a preliminary investigation, the results may give support for in arise the prediction equations.