



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_10070
Title of the Manuscript:	Multifactorial Analyses of Morphological Traits of Helmeted Guinea Fowls <i>Numidia meleagris</i>
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	The manuscript requires an overhaul as follows: • The title is incomplete, this should reflect state, country and system of production used to raise the birds • There is/are no objective(s) of the study in the Abstract. The list of traits measured should also be clearly stated. The sampling unit and procedure should be clearly described including the population and sample sizes. The level of significance should be stated. The Abstract is poorly written and requires extensive modification to improve its readability and suitability to the journal • The Introduction is of the right length but leaves out information of guinea fowl. Avoid using abbreviation before the word is written in full. The objective is not related to the title of the study • Materials and Methods – Sub section 2.1 covers too much information that is not related to the study. Too many maps labeled as figures, reduce to one. Improve the caption of maps/figures. Sub section 2.2 covers too much irrelevant information, should be re-casted to include important information only. Sub section 2.3 is too long, reduce by summarizing better. Show how the 2005 birds relate to states. Also allocate the birds to their sex classes. What is a mature male and female bird in this study? • The Results section is poorly done. Summarize results that relate to your objective(s). Improve the titles of Tables so that they can be read on their own without reference to other texts. • The Discussion should be based on the Results. So far it's not. Re-write according. • In the Conclusion section avoid repetition of results. Conclude on your objective(s). So far this is poorly done. • References are ok.	All the observations/ corrections were duly noted and have been effected in the manuscript.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	• There is need to say something about Animal Welfare Issues in the write up.	
<u>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u>	None that are obvious but there is need to say something about Animal Welfare Issues in the write up	
<u>Are there plagiarism issues in this manuscript?</u>	None that are obvious but there us need to run the write up through relevant software to check for plagiarism	