



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_34380
Title of the Manuscript:	AGGREGATION OF BASIC REGULAR BLOOD ELEMENTS IN CALVES OF MILK FEEDING
Type of the 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>The detailed information about the statistical model should be given in the material and methods section. In my opinion the more adequate statistical test for this kind of the investigation would be the an ANOVA with repeated measurements and Tukey's multiple range post hoc test. Nevertheless, it seems that authors haven't observed any statistically confirmed differences in analysed indices. Even if the differences haven't been confirmed, the P values should be given in the tables for each analysed parameter. The results of the LPO, TBA active products and other should be also summarised in the tables. The discussion part should be rewritten, because the statements of the authors are mostly the speculations e.g. – authors are writing about the neutrophils receptors maturation but they have not been analysing such parameters.</p> <p>Please clarify the ethical issue if any.</p> <p>The number of an agreement of the local ethical committee should be given in the text.</p>	<p>Dear colleagues!</p> <p>Authors are sincerely grateful to you for the made remarks directed to elimination of shortcomings of the manuscript and its improvement.</p> <p>We have added the text of work as information on the carried-out statistical processing of the received material.</p> <p>We have provided in the table p as you recommended to us. We have added the table with data on perokisny oxidation of lipids.</p> <p>We have tried to add the text of discussion with information.</p> <p>We have tried to explain questions of ethics in work and have provided data on a research assmotreniye ethical committees.</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>lines 5-8 Information about the number of calves, the breed and the duration of the experiment is repeated detailly in lines 9-12. Authors should omit the general statement and replace it with detailed one</p>	<p>We have tried to make necessary corrections.</p>
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>I am recommending its correction by the native speaker. If the editorial board would decide to allow</p>	<p>We gave our article to the proofreader for correction regarding language.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	the authors to revise the manuscript I am recommending a change of its present form to short communication.	
--	--	--