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| PART 1: Comments | | |
|  | Reviewer’s comment **Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | **Author’s Feedback** (It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
| **Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | **This manuscript is very important for the users(researchers, communities, stakeholders, generally for all livestock producers particularly ruminant animal holders). This type of research is very relevant as silage making is one of the strategies to store and keep feeds as green feed source particularly in the dry season where other green forages are not found.** | This manuscript is important for researchers, livestock farmers, and feed specialists because it contributes practical insights into optimizing silage formulation using local absorbents. The research findings support feed security strategies, especially in areas facing seasonal shortages of green forages. The study provides empirical data on the digestibility and pH outcomes of different absorbents, which is critical for improving feed efficiency in ruminant animals. Therefore, this work holds relevance for both academic development and applied livestock production, particularly in tropical and subtropical regions. |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | **The title is suitable** | The title is suitable and reflects the study's main objectives and content clearly. |
| Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here. | **The abstract is good, but in ‘study design' part: what is your benchmark to use 12.5%, 22% and 32.4% of absorbent?** | The abstract is clear and informative. However, in the 'study design' section, please clarify the rationale or benchmark for choosing the absorbent levels of 12.5%, 22%, and 32.4%. This will help readers understand the basis for experimental formulation and its relevance. |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. | The manuscript is scientifically correct, but please incorporate some of my minor comments below in the general comment section | The manuscript is scientifically sound. However, the reviewer’s valuable minor comments should be incorporated for completeness and consistency. |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** | In the reference section, there is some inconsistences. Example, please check the following references  \_Anggara.......  . AAAS 2020  \_Dwipayana......  IG 2019  \_Putra, DA 2017 | Thank you for the observation. I have revised the citation format for the mentioned references and replaced some with more recent journal sources to ensure consistency and relevance. |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | Yes the language is suitable | Yes, the language is suitable for scholarly communication. Only a few typographic or stylistic points (e.g., abbreviation formatting) need revision. |
| Optional/General comments | **Generally, please incorporate the following comments**  **\*the introduction is good, but it lacks source or citation particularly in the 1st paragraph**  **\*in the abstract section you said that each treatment replicated 5 times but in the materials and method section, I didn’t get such expression (about treatment replication), so make it consistency**  **\*Please use the abbreviated word OMD not omd is some part of your manuscript**  **\*in the result section: if there is no any significant difference between groups, what is the importance of using similar superscripts (a)?**  **\*inconsistencies of using the word ‘et al', sometimes you used Author et al (year) and in another time you used Author et al.(year).......example you cite Mcdonald et al (2002)** | Thank you for the detailed suggestions. We will revise the following accordingly:   * Add relevant citations to the first paragraph of the introduction for proper academic support. * Ensure consistency between the abstract and methodology regarding the number of replications. * Standardize all abbreviations (e.g., use "OMD" consistently throughout the manuscript). * Clarify in the results section when there is *no significant difference*, I symbolize it with (a) * Unify the usage of “et al.” formatting across all in-text citations (e.g., McDonald et al. (2002)). |
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|  | **Reviewer’s comment** | **Author’s Feedback** (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)* | No, there are no ethical issues in this manuscript. The study does not involve animal experimentation or human subjects. All laboratory and field practices followed local institutional and scientific guidelines for feed research and sampling procedures. |