SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJEA_25197**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Forage Intake and Wastage by Ewes in Pea/Hay Barley Swath Grazing and Bale Feeding Systems**
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	The authors summarize the results of an experiment where evaluated ewe ADG, forage DMI and wastage for pea/hay barley forage fed in a swathed versus baled feeding system in the Fort Ellis Experiment Station of Montana State University located 10 km east of Bozeman. The manuscript is well written. I think that Introduction is understandable, clear and comprehensive exposing the reader to the topic. Purpose and objectives are scientifically appropriate. The investigators appeared to have been very thorough in their sampling and data collection. The methodology used is correctly described. So described it allow experiment to be reproduced. I think the experimental results are thoroughly and logically interpreted in the discussion and presented with clarity. Author compared the results obtained with the experiments and results of previous studies on the relevant subject, however, the discussion is short and should be expanded. *Below, I point out a couple points that the authors should consider in revision:* -The tables do not include the references of acronyms	Suggestion included in manuscript

	used. The author should incorporate the meaning of the acronym (CP, NDF, ADF) because the reader cannot know them. - Rainfall should be expressed in "mm" and not "cm" as is written in Materials and Methods (2.2 Study Site and Forages). -The discussion is brief. I think it should be compared in more detail the results obtained with other experimental work. The author should not only mention general results of other studies by other researchers but discuss them.	Changes made in the manuscript We feel we discussed the papers in sufficient detail to address the findings of the research. We would need more specific detail as to where the discussion is lacking.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		