



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_48930
Title of the Manuscript:	Scientific and technical experiment for manufacturing silage in Jordan
Type of the Article	Short 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	No compulsory revision observed.	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. The Topic, Abstract, 2 Figures, 1 Table, 4 Plates, Conclusion and References are all acceptable. However, few corrections could be done to upgrade this work.</p> <p>Amendments could be made as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lines 3 – 4: Topic could be put as – Scientific and Technical Experiment for Manufacturing Silage in Jordan 2. Between Line 11 and 12: Within Abstract; Could amend as - - Mixings of the fodders of alfalfa and corn were made - 15.25% when fodders of corn mixed 100% with alfalfa by 100%. 3. Line 13: Keywords: Fodders of corn and alfalfa; Jordan; Silage. 4. Line 20: as well as to enhance digestion in livestock. 5. Line 26: Some previous researchers [1] reported in the advanced corn silage management 6. Line 32: Could change graph (1) to Figure 1. 7. After Line 33: Could delete Topic at Top - Crude Protein % for Some Basic Feed Materials 8. In Line 36: Could put Topic of the graph as – Figure 1. Crude protein percentages of corn silage, alfalfa silage, molasses and some mixtures 9. Line 41: Could delete graph (1). And put as – Figure 1. 10. In Line 46: Could change (8.795%). To (8.80%). 11. In Line 47: Could remove brackets and put as - which is 15.25%. 12. Table 1. Mixtures of fermented silage for 50 days and results of the analysis 13. In Table 1. Could change Average Crude Protein % from 8.795 to 8.80 14. In Line 60: Could change the graph (2) indicate to - the Figure 2. indicate 15. Below Line 63: Could delete heading - Crude Protein % for Experimental Mixtures from above the graph 16. Between Lines 64 to70: Could put as Footnote - Vertical bars indicate the (+/-) standard error of the mean (n=5) Could put heading of the graph as – Figure 2. Crude protein percentages of current applied experimental mixtures Line 69: Could be changed as follows – Plates 1 to 4 :show steps 1 to 4 of samples preparing for fermentation. The fodders of green corn In Line 70: Could insert 'was' as – which was used to cut 17. Lines 83and 88: Could be put as - Plate 1. Corn fodder before cutting Plate 2. Feeding of the machine operated by the tractor Plate 3. Cutting output Plate 4. Filling process 18. In Lines 93, 95 and 96: Could be put as follows - 	<p>Highlighted in yellow</p> <p>All comments were undertaken and put into practice</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Could add 'fodders of' as - 100 percent of the fodders of green corn to 100 percent of the green</p> <p>Could add 's' to content and return as – protein contents and high economic returns.</p>	
<u>Optional/General</u>	<p>the green corn to 100 percent</p> <p>comments</p> <p>Good work, sir.</p>	

PART 2:

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