

Reviewer's report

Title: The added nutritional value of grass-fed beef.

Version: 1 Date: 1 September 2009

Reviewer: Michael E Dikeman

Reviewer's report:

I am recommending that the manuscript entitled "The added nutritional value of grass-fed beef" be accepted with major revisions. The review is clearly and well written but is rather biased toward grass-fed beef relative to grain-fed beef. Scollan et al., Meat Science, 2006, 74:17-33, has an excellent paper on the effects of nutrition on beef lipids and meat quality that should be reviewed by the authors because that review also makes some important statements about potential palatability problems of grass-fed beef and the potential for reduced shelf-life. In addition, he addresses the practical aspect of inadequate CLA content in beef for humans, even from grass-fed beef. Dr. Steve Smith, 2007, Texas A & M, made a presentation at the Reciprocal Meat conference, published by the American Meat Science Association, that presented data showing that grain-fed beef has advantages in higher Oleic FA and more desirable HDL/LDL ratio than beef from cattle fed on forage for considerable time and then grain fed. Again, the authors should review this work and consider 'balancing' the paper more. The authors should also read that report.

I am attaching a draft of the manuscript that I copied from the pdf file into MS Word. I have edited, raised questions, and made inclusions that I think need to be made. My edits are highlighted as "track changes". Because of the 'pasting' from pdf to MSW, the line numbers appear in the beginning and in the middle of some sentences. I edited this as if it was from one of my own graduate students. I chose this avenue of identifying edits, errors, additions, etc. because it is very inefficient to state (as an example) "on page 7, line 22, the sentence should be changed to read....."