



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_12035
Title of the Manuscript:	Commercial Additive or Propionic Acid Used for Fermentation and Aerobic Stability of Silage with Pig Excreta
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		
Minor REVISION comments	Line 3, suppose the title reads as 'The effect of commercial additive (Toxic-chec) and propionic acid on the fermentation and aerobic stabiloity of silage with pig exreta. ABSTRACT: Line 1 of the abstract, after effect of, insert 'Toxic-chec commercial additive and propionic acid on the fermentation and aerobic stability of' and delete 'additives on'. Line 2, after 'and urea' delete 'a commercial additive (Toxic-chec) and propionic'. Line 3, delete 'acid was tested during fermentation' and begin a new sentence with 'The growth' and after 'micro organisms' insert 'in the silage' and after stability add 'of the silage were tested.' Line 4, after 'conducted in' insert 'the' and after treatments insert 'made in triplicate'. Line 6 and 7 can be closed so that Line 7 does not begin a new paragraph. Line 8, delete 'belonging to Livestock Program in the' and delete 'Campus' and insert it after State and replace 'of' with a comma. Line 9-11, these are results but could state what the effect of the additives or treatments were on pH and VFAs. Similarly from Line from Line 14-Line 17, these are results that need to be interpreted in terms of the effects	We agree with successful reviews. Thanks for the suggested corrections allows us to improve the present investigation



SDI Review Form 1.6

	of the treatments as Line 18-21 suggests. THE TEXT: Line 22, replace 'major' with 'big' and insert 'challenge on' and delete 'challenge' after Mexico. Line 23, delete 'have impact on' and insert 'is a source of apollution to' the environment, water and soil due to it's... Line 25, begin sentence with 'It also causes pollution of air due.... Delete 'Also produce spoilage of air quality'. Line 26, delete 'additionally' and insert 'and'. Line 27, after conditions insert 'it emits' and delete 'like' after gases and insert 'such as'. Line 28, after 'problem is' insert 'to use the pig excreta in animal feeds, such as silage... and after 'diet for' insert 'ruminant'. After animals begin a new sentence with 'It' Line 30, after animals insert 'and its reuse in animal feeds can reduce.... Line 44, after (14), delete 'very little has' and insert 'Few studies have been done on the... Line 46, after 'of air' insert 'and' Line 49, after 'stability of' delete 'silage' and insert 'silage' after pig excreta. Line 60, delete 'belonging to Livestock Program in the' and delete 'Campus' after College and insert it after Monteceillo State,' and delete 'of'. Table : 1. Suppose the title read as 'Fermentation properties pig excreta silages with their treatments'. 2. Which way should the table be read, ie, along the rows or down the columns? How were the means separated, ie, was it by LSD?, such that, for example, ^{abc}Values having different	We agree with successful reviews. Thanks for the suggested corrections allows us to improve the present investigation
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	superscripts in a row are significantly ($P \leq 0.05$) different. 3. If so the Ph can not be compared with the VFAs or ammonia and the values for Acetic and ammonia are very high and cannot have the same superscripts with the rest of the values. 4. If down the columns, the values for acetic acid or ammonia, for example, may not have the same superscripts. 5. Suppose the table was aligned as follows; <u>Properties</u> <u>Treatments</u> T1 T2 T3 DM Acetic acid Propionic acid Butyric acid <u>Ammonia N</u> ----- ^{abc}Values having different superscripts in a row are significantly ($P \leq 0.05$) different. T1 - T2 - T3 - So that values can be compared along the row between treatments as in Table 3 and 4. Table 2 can be aligned in the same way. Ideally if the Table is clear a reader should be able to follow it and therefore detailed repetition of data already in the table can be avoided. Detailed repetition of data already in the table makes reading of the paper by other readers difficult. Some values or range of values may be picked on and compared to values obtained by other workers to give strength to the study findings.	We agree with successful reviews. Thanks for the suggested corrections allows us to improve the present investigation
--	---	--

	Then data or trends in the data should be interpreted in relation to the treatments and discussed. Else where in the text; 1. Line 134, ... Resulting in lower Ph in T1 and T3, relative to T2, but in the table T1 is higher than T2 and T3. 2. Line 136 -137, the values, 75%, 15%, and 10% referring to Table 1 are not reflected in the table. 3. ‘silage pig excreta’ perhaps should be ‘pig excreta silage’. 4. Line 149 and 151, reference is made to lactic acid but it was determined, yet it is an important measure of the quality silage. See line168 and 169. 5. Line 151 and 152, propionic acid is being used as data yet it was a treatment. 6. Etc. 7. Line 343, insert ‘were’ and delete ‘both’ and replace “as’ with ‘and’. 8. Line 344, after silage, begin a new sentence with ‘The treatments’ did not... and replace ‘due it’ with ‘as they’. 9. Line 346, insert ‘in’ after yeasts. 10. Line 347, replace ‘potentiated’ with ‘and showed potential for aerobic stabilization of silage and prevented.... 11. Line 348-351, Molasses was not part of the treatments and therefore difficult to justify 9% molasses. 12. Line 350-351, ‘silage pig manure’ perhaps should be ‘pig manure silage’	We agree with successful reviews. Thanks for the suggested corrections allows us to improve the present investigation We agree with successful reviews. Thanks for the suggested corrections allows us to improve the present investigation
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	plagiarism issues -: Line 136 -137, the values, 75%, 15%, and 10% referring to Table 1 are not reflected in the table.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	A lot of research has been done on inclusion of Animal excreta in animal diets and recommendations made accordingly. Therefore, this research contributes to that effort. The text should be made reader friendly for the wider readership.	We agree with successful reviews. Thanks for the suggested corrections allows us to improve the present investigation