



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	<p>Line 1-2: The topic "Aggregation of basic regular blood elements in calves of milk feeding" should be "Aggregation of basic regular blood elements in calves during the phase of milk feeding".</p> <p>Line 4-32: There should be a more orderly and concise arrangement of the abstract with abstract content appearing under appropriate subtitles such as "aim", "study design", "place and duration of study", "methodology", "results" and "Conclusion"</p> <p>Line 5-6, 10: In place of writing "black-many coloured breed" find out the specific breed of calf used and report it.</p> <p>Line 6-7: The statement "between the 11th and the 30th days of life" should be between 11 to 30 days of life.</p> <p>Line 9-10: The statement "work was conducted with the help of 39 calves of black-many colored breed, taken into investigation on the 11th day of life" is not grammatically correct and seems unnecessarily repetitive in abstract, please remove.</p> <p>Line 14: "to the increase of spontaneous aggregation" should be replaced with "for the increase in spontaneous aggregation"</p> <p>Line 19, 21, 23: Write the full meaning of the acronym "AP" and "ADP".</p> <p>Line 24-25: poor grammatical construction, please rephrase the statement correctly and be concise and clear with your report.</p> <p>Line 41: "Its evidence is under" should be "it is evident under"</p>	<p>Dear reviewer!</p> <p>Authors express you huge gratitude for very detailed study of the text of the manuscript and the made valuable remarks of rather available defects. We have tried to eliminate available in the work in full accordance with your remarks.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Line 83-84: “with alight tendency to strengthening” this statement is grammatically incorrect. Did you mean “with a slight tendency to increase”?</p> <p>Line 85-86: From which days were there increase in AHP and TBA active products?</p> <p>Line 93-94, 103-104,107-108: What table is indicating the results you are reporting? The table should appear in results and not after reference.</p> <p>Line 109-122: What is the significance or impact of the aggregation of blood element? Please justify this statement properly in your discussion so one can understand better the basis of this research.</p> <p>Line 121-122: Statement you made is not correct should be “it can explain the slight ability in aggregation of basic regular blood elements in calves during the phase of milk feeding”.</p> <p>Line 259-260: The figures in the table should show level of significance (p value) if present .</p>	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>Line 5-6: “There was formed” and “which” should be removed from the statement</p> <p>Line 36: The statement “in a living body blood,” should be “in a living body, blood,”</p> <p>Line 39: It should be metabolic waste/ end products and not metabolic products.</p> <p>Line 43: Please what do you mean by “can break metabolic processes”? Explain further. You can also use a more appropriate scientific term e.g antagonize, inhibit etc</p> <p>Line 58: The statement “The work was conducted with the help of 39 calves” should be “The work was conducted using 39 calves”</p> <p>Line 92: “to the rise of” should be “in the rise of”</p>	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>There are too many errors in terms of grammatical expressions in this manuscript. There can be a better use of grammar.</p> <p>The report can be made more straightforward and clear enough to understand, moreover justify the work more and essence of the research in your introduction.</p>	<p>We have tried to correct grammar. We have tried to state work as clearer language.</p>