



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	2013_IJBcRR_7382
Title of the Manuscript:	Hematological Values in Sheep Fed a Diet containing Black Cumin (Nigella sativa) Seed Oil
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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	As commented in the manuscript. In particular, the results/discussion section was not well handled. It was quite difficult to follow. Values were provided, just bar charts. It is better to (1) present the results separately to highlight the unusual or marked observation before referring the reader to the appropriate chart or table. (2) Discuss the results based on the presentation by highlighting the marked and significant observation and comparing same with previous studies. It is not acceptable to compare the results of this study with that of rats because that was not the aim of the study. And, the study was not designed to allow such wide comparison. Majority of the results were not significant, hence need not to be discussed. Also, There is no basis for the wide comparison in the conclusion. The conclusion does not follow from the result of the study. This may have derived from the poor handling of the results presentation and discussion section.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	The result should be presented with values in figure. The discussion should be guided by the aim and scope of the study and should avoid unsupported extrapolation. The conclusion should be apt and must follow from the results of the study.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The researcher(s) did not state whether the animals were sacrificed at the end of the study or not?	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anthony Cemaluk C. EGBUONU
Department, University & Country	Department of Biochemistry, Michael Okpara University of Agriculture Umudike, Nigeria.