



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_36159
Title of the Manuscript:	Bioconversion of Rice Straw as a Ruminant feed Using Three Strains of White Rot Fungi
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	I have reviewed the paper and I feel after the corrections are made it can be published. To make it easy for the authors to do corrections I have highlighted the text in yellow. Introduction: Your introduction pg 2 line 25 – 36, too detail on something that is not related. Suggest remove or replace with similar studies. Table 5 is not necessary, you can draw figures for this. Anyway, discussions on gas production at various hours are not necessary, unless you have interesting results on rates of gas production. What is important are the a, b and c values. When citing level of significance in the text ($p < 0.05$) should be used all the time, since your subscripts for the tables indicated so. Do not use $p = 0.00$ at all. Table 1. When adf, ndf and lignin are analysed you do not need to analyse for crude fibre.	
Minor REVISION comments	Citing References: see highlights of ref number. Usually you can mention authors name ...et al [...] at the start of a sentence. Also , when you state ..according to ...name of author, followed by [...] Page 8. Line 196, 197 – “a” is not soluble fraction. It is gas production at 0 hour. Similarly “b” is not total degradable fraction, it is total gas production. Don't get confused with nylon bag technique by Orskov. Line 172, “t” is not time lag. It is time of incubation. Line 222. Where does the high CP come from. Can the fungus synthesize its own CP without source of nitrogen, since your substrates have the same N content? Line 238, “lower carbohydrate” fraction- you did not determine carbohydrate fraction in your analysis Table 3. methane production, how was it determined and the units (per g or per 100 ml rumen fluid) are not clear. ML means what?	
Optional/General comments	Overall paper good for publications. A few points to improve your paper	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	A.R. Alimon
Department, University & Country	Department of Animal Nutrition and Feed Science, Universiti Putra Malaysia, Malaysia And Universitas Gadjah Mada, Indonesia