

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_113411
Title of the Manuscript:	Clinical, pathological and epidemiological aspects of Cephalopina titillator larval infestation in Camelus dromedaris of Rafsanjan region, Iran
Type of the Article	

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>We consider it very important if we start from the fact that it is a very detailed study of fly infestation in an animal species of fundamental importance in the Middle East. It provides new knowledge to this type of parasitism.</p> <p>We suggest that the title be shortened to this form. "Clinical, pathological and epidemiological aspects of Cephalopina larvae. exciter in Camelus dromedaris from the Rafsanjan region, Iran"</p> <p>It is in our opinion perfect.</p> <p>It's appropriate.</p> <p>The authors worked very well on the logical structure of the research. His job description was very clear and concise.</p> <p>There were sufficient references, although bibliographies that were cited in the text were omitted and vice versa. The authors should correct this aspect. See comments on the reviewed work.</p> <p>It is worth highlighting how well written the work is, both the text and the tables and figures were clear and well structured. We only pointed out the use of the bibliography, which becomes very common among researchers, which we attribute to lack of attention. in this important part of the research work.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>In our opinion it is correct</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Correct the suggestions that appear in the revised work. Pay attention to the bibliography.</p>	

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Luis Remedios Hernández
Department, University & Country	Cuba