



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">Journal of Applied Life Sciences International</a>  |
| 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 ( <i>Oryctolagus cuniculus</i> ) |
| 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**

|                                     | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>   | <b>Author's comment</b> (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) |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| <b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments | <p><b>The statistics is faulty and it nullifies the result.</b></p> <p>This is faulty<br/>There are obviously more than one factor.<br/>Factor 1 - the HS, IMO+HS, IMO+HS+ VIT.<br/>Factor 2 - Time of assessment.<br/>This affected your result and its interpretation.<br/>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.</p> <p>Run the appropriate statistical analysis and update the tables. That will require another result</p> |  |
| <b>Minor</b> REVISION comments      | <p>The Discussion sections should be more readable, by dividing it into sections of the different trials.<br/>Tables' footnotes- the statements are wrong. P values cannot be used to superscripts. the superscripts should be inserted as revealed from LSD</p>  |  |
| <b>Optional/General</b> comments    | <p>The study is very good and its design has sound scientific basis, however the statistical inadequacy nullifies the result presentations and the tables.<br/>Some references are incorrect or not properly listed.</p>  |  |

**PART 2:**

|   | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>  | <b>Author's comment</b> (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) |
|---|--|--|
| <b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b> | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> |  |

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |                                     |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Name:                            | <b>Jimoh O.A.</b>                   |
| Department, University & Country | <b>Federal Polytechnic, Nigeria</b> |