

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_95743
Title of the Manuscript:	CLINICAL SIGNS OF SEASONAL DISEASES DYNAMICS IN CALVES CAUSED BY ROTAVIRUS AND CORONAVIRUS INFECTION
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:

(<https://journalarrb.com/index.php/ARRB/editorial-policy>)

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The manuscript is of interest to cow farmers. Cattle disease is important for diagnosing and treating youth. The manuscript suffers as does the structure</p> <p>2 yes</p> <p>3. must be rewritten The summary must be rewritten to include your own results. What the author writes is general, ambiguous, nothing concrete. Rectify.</p> <p>4. For the results, other more exorsive graphics should be used. The current graphics do not have appropriate settings and the results are not visible.</p> <p>5. 6. During discussions, the own results of the study should be commented on by comparison with results from the literature. more and more recent references must also be used.</p> <p>The conclusion must be rethought and rewritten, it does not reflect the objectives of the study. The concrete results must be briefly presented.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	I am satisfied	
Optional/General comments	correct the amendments in the attachment	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ciornei Ștefan
Department, University & Country	University of life Science, Romania