



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_51267
Title of the Manuscript:	ANTHELMINTIC POTENCY OF NEEM (Azadirachta indica) LEAF MEAL ON WEST AFRICAN DWARF (WAD) SHEEP
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	<p>1. Could still check to put the whole manuscript in the form acceptable by this Journal (AJAAR).</p> <p>This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. Very few amendments could be made to improve on the write-up.</p>	<p>Thank you Sir/ Ma for the time taken to go through this manuscripts line by line to make it a better one.</p> <p>All the necessary observations and corrections will be look into as you rightly suggested. Thank you so much.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Could effect the following corrections –</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Line 11: completely randomized design Could add 's' as follows – Lines 49 and 51: goats ; Line 58: ruminants ; Line 83: Materials; Line 65: MATERIALS AND METHODS ; Line 105: 90 days; Line 190: Animals fed ; Line 66: Experimental Site ; Line 81: for about five hours. ; Below Line 100: In Table 1 - Neem leaf meal (NLM) 0 5 10 15 Line 137: g/dl. While $4.15 \times 10^6 / \mu\text{l}$ to $5.03 \times 10^6 / \mu\text{l}$, Below Line 156: Haemoglobin Concentration (g/dl) Could add '%' as follows – Line 177: 1.24% ; Line 183: 3.00% ; Line 191: 1.42% ; Line 231: of Neem leaf meal (NLM) Line 232: ^{a,b,c} Mean values followed by different letters in the same row are significantly different ($P \leq 0.05$) Line 238: the faecal egg count (eggs/gram) of the animals Line 266: Could put in italics as - <i>Haemonchus contortus</i> Line 269: Could delete full stop and put and as - (Niezen <i>et al.</i>, 1998) and Line 274: levels of neem leaf meal Line 275: ^{a,b,c} Mean values followed by different letters in the same row are significantly different ($P \leq 0.05$) Line 276: FEC - Faecal egg count Line 285: Figure 1: The average initial and final faecal egg count of sheep fed neem leaf meal (NLM) Line 288 to 289: Animals supplemented with neem leaf meal (NLM) based concentrate diets had significant reduction in their faecal egg count compared to the control treatment (without NLM). Line 294: could be exploited. Could effect the following corrections under the REFERENCES – Line 307: Alok, J. A. ; Line 340: Could arrange initials well and delete et al. ; Line 347: Daramola, J. O., Adedoye, A. A., Fatoba, T. A. and Soladoye, A. O. Line 357: the Gambia 2003; Line 363: Could add initial - and Chmielak., Line 391: Production of faecal ; Line 395: Pre-pubertal Buck ; Line 428: Turkey. 2005; <i>Parasitol. Research</i>, 	
Optional/General comments	<p>Good work, could still read through and effect corrections.</p>	



PART 2:

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