



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_32990
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Hemoglobin and Potassium polymorphism on milk production traits in goats
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 <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	Consider to resubmit this article as a short communication. 1) The English language needs to be profoundly revised; 2) Please, check carefully the authors guidelines (follow a pattern/criteria); 3) The introduction section needs to be improved. The introduction section needs to convince the reader that your work is important and relevant, frame the questions being addressed, and provide context for the findings being presents. As it is written, the article did not capture the attention of the readers; 4) What the advantage of the use of haemoglobin and potassium polymorphisms on milk production traits in goats over other parameters commonly used? Please, clearly stated the aims and importance of your investigation. 5) Please avoid to give too many citations for one point; 6) Tstry to be concise (i.e. Material and Methods – study area, animals and managements; Blood sampling), otherwise give more details about the procedure to determine the haemoglobulin and potassium types, breed(s), etc. Do you have the data of somatic cell count and bacteriological analysis of the milk samples (mastitis incidence)? 7) The discussion section needs to be profoundly improved. Identify potential limitations and weaknesses and comment on the relative importance of these to your interpretation of the results and how they may affect the validity of the findings;	All comments have been noted and corrected accordingly.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Line 22: Large number? How many? What their importance? And raised for? Give the units of the variables used in the results section; Lines 158-159 – “in other species”? Give more details and cite some references;	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		