



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOB_39625
Title of the Manuscript:	Haemoparasites of Bovine Species Slaughtered In Port Harcourt Metropolis, Rivers 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>)

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	<p>I would like to thank and appreciate the author (s) who spend an effort to propagate data from the area of the study but unfortunately, the work is still not enough due to the following points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The design of the study is not clear, the samples collected from healthy animals in slaughter houses and it is somewhat strange because we usually collect samples from farms and villages to give us a complete picture about the situation of blood parasites. 2. The introduction is too long and non-informative also it contains more unwanted data. 3. Materials and Methods: The authors used two types of blood films one of them is the thick blood film which not recommended for diagnosis of intra-erythrocyte infection like Theileria and babesia. 4. Results: Anaplasma is not a parasite now. 5. The Authors carried out some statistical analysis but there are some mistakes in the tables e.g. the total samples from each area was 35 (table 1) while in table 2 the first area has 45 samples and 30 per each other. 6. The authors said that animals of old age are more susceptible but they didn't clear the age of slaughtered animals in Nigeria. 7. We usually use infestation with the parasite not infection. 8. The results not clear at all and no species identified while they said that they identified the species morphologically. 9. The discussion and conclusion are not clear. 10. The English language not suitable for scientific research paper. 	<p>Thanks for your comments. We hereby respond as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Our slaughters are more or less like grazing farms as animals are not completely held in captivity but allowed to graze occasionally. 2. Well taken 3. Thin blood film was also used in line with literature. 4. Well taken. 5. Mistakes have been rectified. 6. The ages were in respect of maturity ie Matured and Immatured 7. Well taken and effected. 8. Parasites were identified ie genera. We didn't write that we identified any species. 9. They have been rephrased. 10. Well taken
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		