

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Animal and Veterinary Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAVS_91860
Title of the Manuscript:	Life cycle of Hyalomma dromedarii ticks (Acari: Ixodidae) on Sheep under experimental conditions
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:

(<https://www.journalajravs.com/index.php/AJRAVS/editorial-policy>)

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ In the abstract, it is best to include some background in the first part, methodology need to clear and to the standard see the comment in the main body; your conclusion in the abstract need to be inclusive. ➤ In the introductory part, I suggest the authors to revisit and use recent information to support your study, for detailed see the comment given in the main document. ➤ In the Materials and methods, the authors describe in good manner with basic concern that need to explained and revised otherwise, selection of experimental sheep, determination of the number of treatment group and use of standard etc see the comment in the main document. ➤ In the result, I recommend revision since the narration and the table almost repeated so better to revisit it as you see in the comment given. I also suggest analysing the association or correlation between the independent with the dependent variables in separate table. ➤ In the Discussion, some of the statement need revision and require strong scientific justification see the comment in the main article. ➤ Your conclusion needs to be inclusive and more specific to your result. ➤ The other comment should be addressed accordingly. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There is extensive editorial issues that should be corrected. ➤ Recent source should be used some of the information are out-dated and should follow the journal citation format. ➤ During the experimentation process how the animal health status was maintained, this should be clearly indicated. 	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Generally the authors revisited all the concerned issues and presented the result and discussion in more clear manner. 	

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?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>Yes, how the experimental animal welfare is maintained because the procedure affects animal health and leads to stress as sheep is more prone to die of such harsh condition???</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Edget Abayneh Alembo
Department, University & Country	Arba Minch University, Ethiopia