Journal Name:	Journal of Applied Life Sciences International
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JALSI_45200**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Effects of Immobilization and Heat Stress and Supplementation of Antioxidants on Thermoregulation and Haematological Responses in Male Rabbits (Oryctolagus cuniculus)**
Type of the Article	**Research**

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	**The statistics is faulty and it nullifies the result.** This is faulty There are obviously more than one factor. Factor 1 - the HS, IMO+HS, IMO+HS+ VIT. Factor 2 - Time of assessment. This affected your result and its interpretation. a situation where you compared parameters irrespective of the time, taking to account that they are not homogeneous as all conditions were not similar. i suggest you rerun the analysis using factorial or two way and show if there exist interaction between time of assessment and treatments. Run the appropriate statistical analysis and update the tables. That will require another result	An experienced statistician was consulted and the approach adopted in the manuscript has been validated . We intended to use a simple programme in analysis of the data , investigating the interactions was not indicated as one of the objectives of this study . One way AOVA test according to complete randomized design was used . The difference between means was separated by LSD test .
Minor REVISION comments	The Discussion sections should be more readable, by dividing it into sections of the different trials. Tables' footnotes- the statements are wrong. P values cannot be used to superscripts. the superscripts should be inserted as revealed from LSD	In this Manuscript only 5 parameters (Tr , HR , PCV , TLC , DLC) were included and the same parameters were investigated in the 3 trials . The Discussion that was 70 lines was relevant and acceptable , leaning on 48 references .
Optional/General comments	The study is very good and its design has sound scientific basis, however the statistical inadequacy nullifies the result presentations and the tables. Some references are incorrect or not properly listed.	References have been revised .

PART 2:

	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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	