



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

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 Article:	Original Research Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
<p>I would like to thank the author (s) again because he try to correct the data 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 still not clear, the data not informative and not of public interest 2. 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. 3. Results: Anaplasma is not a parasite now. 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. And now simply he corrects the numbers? 4. The results not clear at all and no species identified while they said that they identified the species morphologically. 5. The discussion and conclusion are not clear. 6. The work is not sufficient for international publication and lack in novelty. 7. The English language not suitable for scientific research paper. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The reviewer is requested to point out areas that are not clear in the design. 2. If the thick blood film is not recommended, the authors went ahead to use the thin blood film as well for clarity. 3. Well taken . Anaplasma has been corrected to be an organism. The reviewer pointed out an error in the values in Table 1 which the author realized and effected. It was wrongly captured. 4. The authors never said they identified to species level. There is a difference between genera and species_we therefore stopped at the Genus level of identification. 5. The reviewer may wish to point out what is not clear about the discussion and conclusion. 6. Reviewer is entitled to his/her opinion. 7. Reviewer is entitled to his/her opinion.