SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**American Journal of Experimental Agriculture**
Manuscript Number:	**2014_AJEA_10066**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Identification of Hematological Markers Suitable for Improving Productivity of Helmeted Guinea Fowl Numida meleagris**
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	**Age range and Weight** What is the age range and weight of the entire helmeted guinea fowl used? What is the age range and weight of the males? What is the age range and weight of the females What is the age range and weight of the different varieties?	
Minor REVISION comments	**Line 97:** "Hemoglobin is a component of the red blood cells and in this study, it is also within reference range [17] for avian (12.20 – 20.00g/dL)." I suggest an addition of the word "it". **Line 108** [22] whereas androgen and thyroxin stimulates erythropoiesis [23]. Reference numbers 22 and 23 are the same reference. Since they are in the same sentence, one of them should be removed. **Lines 167-168** "The White variety also had significantly (P = .05) higher value than in the Ash, Pearl Ash and Pearl Black which had similar values (P > .05)."	

	Please insert the word "which" in the sentence. **Lines 200-201** "PCV is a component of red blood cells hence the pattern of significant differences was similar". PCV, a component of RBC??? Pack Cell Volume (PCV) or haematocrit is the volume of the red cells (erythrocytes) in the blood, expressed as a fraction of the total volume of the blood. I suggest you use the phrase "is the volume of red blood cells". **Lines 223-226** "This indicates that the birds were in similar health status since variations in hemoglobin can be due to living at high altitudes, excessive/under production by bone marrow of blood cells, anemia due to nutritional deficiency, destruction of blood cells internally, liver tumor (hepatomas), kidney tumor and lung diseases" (citation needed). This part should be cited and referenced. **Lines 243-246** "It has been reported that if cells are old and not replaced often (sperocytosis) and *in vivo* and *in vitro* hemolysis occur high MCHC values result; and if the values are obtained when there are too many young RBC (reticulocytes) or when there is iron deficiency, low values are obtained" (citation needed). This part should also be cited and referenced.	

	Lines 250-251 "The MCH value followed a similar pattern as red blood cells; since it is a component of the RBC". MCH is not a component of the RBC. It is a mathematical value (an index) calculated from Haemoglobin (gm/l)/ Red cell count per ml. I suggest you use "since it is dependent on the number of RBCs". **Lines 251-254** "The test defines the type of anemia and cause of anemia if present in species. Wide variations in MCH values could be due to anemia as a result of vitamin B_{12} or/ and folate deficiency, ineffective production in the bone marrow, recent loss and replacement by newer reticulocytic cells from bone marrow and *in vivo* or *in vitro* hemolysis" (citation needed). This section needs to be cited and referenced.	

SDI Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments	**General remark**: this article was overall well written and interesting. Except for minor blemishes, I enjoyed reading it. **Abstract** The abstract was well written and Less than 250 words (219 words to be exact). The author(s) complied with the instruction to authors. Keywords are within the approved limits. **Introduction** The introduction was well structured and easy to follow. It stated the aim of the study with all clarity. **Material and Methods** This section was also well organised. The author(s) adhered strictly to the guide to authors. However, they did not state the age range and weight of the helmeted guinea fowl used which can affect the haematological parameters/indices one way or the other. I suggest that the weight of the animals be correlated with the significant haematological parameters/indices. **Results and Discussion** The authors did not state how the results were presented (Mean ± SD or Mean ± SEM). **Conclusion** The conclusion was well written. It summarized the salient points/findings in the work. **Reference** The reference section was well written except for references 6,7,22 and 27.	

	Acknowledgements Author(s) did not acknowledge any individual or personnel. **Ethical approval** Author(s) did not provide any statement to confirm that they obtained all necessary ethical approval from suitable institutional or state or national or international committee as regards to animal care and handling.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Okoye Jude Ogechukwu**
Department, University & Country	**Department of Medical laboratory Science, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Nnewi Campus, Anambra State, Nigeria.**