



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Animal and Veterinary Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAVS_47943
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparison of the Fitting of Two Mathematical Models to Describe the Ruminal Fermentation Parameters of Some Sources of Plant and Animal Protein Using In Vitro Gas Method
Type of the Article	<u>Original Research Article</u>

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	<p>Abstract. In this study of two mathematical models was used for described rumen fermentation parameters of plant and animal some protein sources using test gas method. This statement is grammatically wrong and the authors need to improve it. Particularly the areas highlighted in red.</p> <p>However, two model at lag phase (T lag) had the significant difference that the amount lag phase in the model EXP than model FRC was higher. Requires grammatical editing.</p> <p>Introduction: Line 20: In relation to fermentation\ Line 20-21:The sentence is incomplete and needs improvement of grammar.</p> <p>The introduction should give an over view. However, in this case I cannot see the find the over view. Even then, all the sentences are either incomplete, hanging or have grammatical errors. Forinstance. Line 34 -37: in most studies related to rumen fermentation parameters by in vitro gas production of the exponential equation ørskov and mcdonald (1979) as (exp) $y=a(1-e^{-ct})$ is used.</p> <p>My suggestion. The topic of the author and the scientific basis is interesting. The writing and expression of the author is very lacking. Aside from several grammatical errors, the methodology lacks a lot of information and is not clear. For instance how did the author collect the gas. Is the mathematical model computerised or manual and then how much of the specific feed was given and what did the author use as the control?</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tayebwa Dickson
Department, University & Country	Makerere University, Uganda