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	What are the advantages of pig manure using in silages should be given (Crude protein content, ammonia, microbial population etc.) It can be compared with poultry, ruminant etc. manure How much is the potential of mexico pig, poultry manure should be given in introduction section. If it is possible nutrient content of samples (crude protein, ash, fiber, fat, dry matter) should be given. There are lots of nitrogen in pig manure, so what is the reason of using urea as nitrogen source. This need a explaination In line 257, non protein nitrogen (NPN) instead of NNP	
Optional/General comments	Nowadays, when we consider removal of agricultural wastes, this kind of experiments have great importance. This MS has scientific value, so it can be published after minor revisions. Suggestions: what are the suggestions for researchers after this research. A study should be planned with animals using this kind of silages and their performance should be examined.	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer