



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Animal and Veterinary Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAVS_50571
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF YEAR OF CALVING ON THE REPRODUCTIVE PERFORMANCE OF HOLSTEIN FRIESIAN COWS IN VOM PLATEAU STATE NIGERIA
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>)

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 paper contains good piece of work, design and analysis are appropriate. The major revision is in discussion part, as per the study the discussion should be in running format and not in subheads, if the author wishes to make subheads it will be better to merge with result.	-Agreed. Sub heads has been removed. -Discussion is now in running format
Minor REVISION comments	The language is a bit shaky, grammatical mistakes are there and have been marked, there are few typographical errors too. The paper is actually written in thesis format that can be changed to give a good readable shape. Introduction for eg can have more emphasis on why this study was undertaken and conclusion part could address that how the objective achieved are usegul.	-Grammatical mistakes and typographical errors where corrected -The thesis should be maintained -Introduction has been adjusted to contain objective and reason why study was undertaken
Optional/General comments	The finding and analysis is good, the author should note that during writing they have to stress why and how there findings are helpful. The recommendation part is a good add on however it must be written in scientific form.	-Noted

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)	-No ethical issues