SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Experimental Agriculture International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JEAI_48556**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Agronomic characteristics, chemical composition and gas production of sugar cane cultivars (Saccharum spp.) for feeding ruminants**
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	This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. The Topic, Abstract, Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results and Discussion, 4 Tables, Conclusion and References are of acceptable standard. However, correction could be done to improve further this write up. 1. References could be clearly re-numbered, and 'et al.' deleted in lines 309, 340, 345, 359, 374 and 389. In Lines 320, 49, 295 state could start with capital letter 's' as – State In Line 337, Cinetics could be changed to Kinetics.	Proposal accepted
Minor REVISION comments	1. **In Lines 3 to 4: Topic could be put as - Agronomic Characteristics, Chemical Composition and** ***In Vitro* Gas Production of Sugarcane Cultivars (*Saccharum spp.*) for Feeding Ruminants** 2. Between Lines 11 and 14 : Could put as follows - and *in vitro* gas production of sugarcane design was a randomized complete block design containing were evaluated for dry matter, of organic matter, crude protein, crude protein, - could delete crude protein in vitro digestibility could put in vtro in italics as – *in vitro* submitted to analysis could be changed to subjected to analysis latency period 2.86 hs could be changed to 2 86h Key words could be put as follows – *Keywords: Saccharum spp.,ruminant feeding, in vitro degradation kinetics* 3. Line 27: Could include 'of' as – high degradability of sucrose 4. Line 37: Could be put as follows – Combining fibre content with digestibility, 5. Lines 90 to 91: Could be put as - ground through 2 mm Then, crude protein (CP), ash and ether 6. Line 144: Could change 'row' to column' as - different letters in the column statistically differ 7. Line 149: Could change NTM to NT as - others presented NT lower 8. Line181: Could add Abreu et al. as - Abreu et al. [18] evaluated 9. Within Lines 237 and 238, (Table 3.) – Could add the unit Mcal/kg as – DE Mcal/kg; NE Mcal/kg and Could delete MS as – ME Mcal/kg 10. Lines 241 to 243: Could be re-arranged as - The mean TDN content of 54.99% observed for the early cultivars RB765418, RB855453, RB855336, SP80-1842 and SP81-1763, on the first clipping, grown in Minas Gerais was lower than the value of 62.47% observed by [20]. 11. Line 244: Could change AFD to ADF 12. Line 254: Could change higher to highest as – cultivars showed highest IVOMD 13. Line261: could change my occur to may occur. 14. Line 266: could change showed higher to showed highest	Proposal accepted The changes we made are yellowed. Since there has been a change in the general formatting of text and tables, the lines are no longer the same as the original article. We do not replace the authors Abreu et al. in line 181 (original article), because who conducted the experiment was Silva et al.

	15. Line 275: Could change in the 'row' statistically to in the column statistically 16. Line 286: could add feed after evaluation of voluntary as – evaluation of voluntary feed intake	
Optional/General comments Good write up.		

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	