



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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	I believe that the authors have committed plagiarism, changing only structural parts of the document, such as the bibliography cited and the order in which they mention each author. The data have the same parameters to be measured, even though they have different measurement periods. They should be more authentic	Dear reviewer! Authors thank for the attentive relation to their work. The provided article is not repetition of already published article in your reputable magazine. It is one more fragment of the big research of all ontogeny of cattle which is conducted by authors with the help same methods for obtaining comparable results. This article is devoted to other stage of ontogenesis and has the digital material. If other methods were applied, then unambiguously it would be impossible to compare and draw the weighed conclusions at an assessment of data on all ontogenesis in our work. Authors draw the attention of dear reviewer that in already published articles it was talked not only of aggregation of uniform elements, but also of vascular control over them. It emphasizes also methodical distinctions of already published and this article.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		