



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_22020
Title of the Manuscript:	A comparative study on the haematology, biochemical alterations in serum composition and pathologic changes in the kidneys of cachetic and non-cachetic cattle in Zaria, Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	These terms should be explained under the introduction for the purpose of clarity <i>cachetic cattle and non-cachetic cattle</i> Models of instruments used for the study were not given under methodology. Table4. the values of Alkaline phosphatase (U/L) 49.57±17.2 a(7-97)59.21±30.09a(7-105) 0-38, the values were quite higher than the reference. Explain this point DISCUSSION: most of the results were statistically insignificant, the author(s) should further explain on this by looking at other parameters that could have caused the effects Ethical Issues: USE OF ANIMALS	1. The term cachexia is taken from cachexiation and this has been defined in the introduction. The opposite of cachexiation (cachexia) is non-cachetic. 2. We cited the list of references and these references described the models of equipment used. There is absolutely no need for repetition. 3. The increase in alkaline phosphatase activity observed may be as a result of possible ongoing liver, muscle, kidney, bone and gastrointestinal mucosal disease. This has been added in the discussion section. 4. We had no reason whatsoever to suspect that other parameters may have interfered with the results to render them insignificant. Therefore, we decided to be safe by not mentioning anything about what we do not have evidence about. 5. Ethical Issues : This was purely an abattoir-based study in which samples were collected only after slaughter, so there was no need for ethical approval. We did not inject, handle the animals in any way or slaughter them ourselves, that required we must be humane, so there was no need for ethical approval.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		