



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	2013_BMRJ_7129
Title of the Manuscript:	STRAINS OF NEWCASTLE DISEASE VIRUS INVOLVED IN OUTBREAKS OF THE DISEASE IN NSUKKA, NIGERIA
Type of the 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Whole write-up not justified. Author should have written the abstract as a single document without necessarily putting it into aim, materials and methods, results, etc. Author did not also present keywords after abstract.	1. SDI templates prescribe that abstracts be broken into Aims, Materials and Methods, Results and Conclusion. 2. We shall review the referencing to ensure it is done as prescribed for SDI journals.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The corresponding author needs to go through and check some references properly. Numbers alone should be cited in the text, giving the names of authors and full reference on the reference page.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Other comments are highlighted in the paper. Generally, the study is worthwhile.	