



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEA_27456
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF ANTIBODY RESPONSE TO NEWCASTLE DISEASE VACCINATION IN POULTRY IN SOME COMMERCIAL FARMS IN THREE LOCAL GOVERNMENT <u>AREAS</u> IN LAGOS STATE, NIGERIA
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	TITLE: in three local government areas..... (see the corrected title) Abstract (1) Line 3: A total of one thousand and sixty two Contradict the total in Page 6 and table 1 (2) Line 6: Two hundred and thirty three..... Not seen in the result or table see pages 6 and 8 (3) Line 10: fifty nine sera tested with forty one (41%)... (4) Line 13 : insert the unit for rodent infestation i.e 1.9 and 2.0 (5) Line 14: Epe with 5% (6) Line 19: ND Ab with fifty seven (57%) Page 6:Data Analysis (Materials and Methods) T-test is mostly use to determine difference between two groups why not use ANOVA Distribution of NDV Antibody titre of poultry..... Please check the figures and compare them with those mentioned in the abstract. Delete Epe 5.00 had the least Page 7: Line 3 : ikorodu with 129 sera..... Not the same with table 2, Also cross check 45.70% ?????? Distribution of ND Antibody titre by Age group: The tables should be explain serially in order of their explanations. 47.70% of layers had immunity in ikorodu (Not seen in table 9) Page 8: Biosecurity Risk Factors: Figures 1.9, PPE 1.86 are not tallying with those in 9 (page 16)	VERY GRATEFUL FOR THE THOROUGH REVIEW. THE CORRECTIONS HAVE BEEN NOTED AND CORRECTED ACCORDINGLY Emikpe, B.O HAVE BEEN CITED



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Table 1: Title from three local Government areas ... NOT FIVE Total of No of sera tested 528 and -ve 103 not tallying with those in the abstract. TABLES SHOULD HAVE MINIMAL HORIZONTAL LINES Table 2: Remove keys AB, ND and LG as they are not mentioned in the table. $\leq$ Means Less than or equals to; $\geq$ means greater than or equals to. Table 3 : Same comments as in table 2 Table s 4, 5,6, 7,8 and 9: Same comments as in previous tables DISCUSSION: Line 10,11, and 12: Indicate the numbers before percentages. Line 19: manamental not Manage mental LAST PARAGRAPH: In conclusion, the study REFERENCES: Emikpe, B.O NOT CITED	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Page 3 (Materials and Methods) Study Area: (1) Insert reference at the end of sentence(1.341sqmls). (2) Line 7: insert reference at the end of sentence.....inhabitants. (3) Line 10: insert reference at the end of the paragraph.....economy of the state. (4) Blood collection: Insert reference at the end of the paragraph....NDV antibodies (5) NDV antigen preparation: Insert reference	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	A Good attempt	