



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Annual Research &amp; Review in Biology</a>
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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> 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>	
<b><u>Minor</u></b> 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>	
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	<p>I am recommending its correction by the native speaker. If the editorial board would decide to allow the</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b><i>Adam Lepczyński</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>Department of Physiology, Cytobiology and Proteomics, Faculty of Biotechnology and Animal Husbandry, West Pomeranian university of Technology, Szczecin, Poland</i></b>