

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Animal and Veterinary Sciences</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAVS_89741
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Sodium dodecyl sulfate- cured nalidixic acid resistant 85-kb plasmid Salmonella gallinarum immunogenicity in brown layer hens</b> The title needs to be reframed.
Type of the Article	Short communication

### **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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Title:</b> The title needs to be reframed because much work needed to be carried out on immunogenicity-cellular immune responses of the treatment groups to make definite recommendations on it. Part of ELISA carried out did give an insight into the immunoglobulins therein.</p> <p><b>Keywords:</b> They are in the right form exception of immunogenicity</p> <p><b>Introduction:</b> The introduction is okay.</p> <p><b>Materials and Methods:</b> The work outline are good. But the statistical tool is conspicuously absent.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">The table obtained from the testing of the plasmid variant in chickens could have been subjected to a simple statistical tool for its impotence. But definitely, there will be a problem with your sample size, and it could be in triplicate format judging from the importance attached to the vaccines in the making.</p> <p><b>Results and Discussion:</b> Results and discussion section were treated well.</p> <p><b>But the following are to be carried out.</b></p> <p>The plasmid-curing results with NAR and others weren't discussed with previous work done. This isn't a nascent work yet though a few points have been scored in its entirety. Did the plasmid cure contain pili in this research? It wasn't mentioned as referred in the reference [17]</p> <p>ELISA-electrophoresis results of NEG, SG9R, and NAR demonstrated the build of immunoglobulin at different stages of vaccination regiments as given. But these encouraging results weren't compared or discuss with previous research work. It ought to be done to complete the vital part of the work done. Also, the ELISA results could have been tabulated for ease of understanding by merely looking at the table in the results section rather than in words.</p> <p>The result of electrophoresis using 0.7 % agarose gel of which plasmid was visualized would have been added to the results section for more understanding and clarity. What was the size of its in dalton? It wasn't stated even though it was compared to a reference [3] as given.</p> <p>By botanical standard, serovar names are written in all small letters, and not starting with a capital letter as seen in this write-up. It needs to be corrected in this manuscript.</p> <p>10 birds per treatment group are inadequate. The research of this magnitude requires not less than 30 birds per treatment group, and possibly in triplicate. This will give more credence to the work, and ample room for critical critics.</p> <p>The reasons for plasmid-cured <i>Salmonella gallinarum</i> vaccinated treatment group with 70% survival rate as shown in the results (Table1) hasn't been advanced here or compared to the previous work done. This is expected in the discussion section but there isn't</p> <p><b>Conclusion:</b> In the end, the outcome is good as per the presented results, which gives fairly impetus for the work done in this field for a future possible Nalidixic acid resistant plasmid cured vaccine group (NAR) to replace the standard vaccines not only on fowl typhoid. However, the number of chickens per treatment group is grossly insufficient for this research status,</p> <p><b>References:</b> References cited in the text and in the reference section were written in order.</p> <p><b>The red word or groups of words</b> indicates corrections to be carried out or the words or word aren't written properly</p> <p><b>The yellow word or groups of words</b> are peer-reviewed comments.</p>	

**Review Form 1.6**

	<b>The blue word or group of words</b> are suggested by the peer-reviewed to be taken into consideration.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The pilot project is good and has a prospect in the future. Once those defects pointed out are corrected, though it will take a short period more-worth doing, it is worth publishing for international audience.	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes. Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Peter Shaba</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>College of Agriculture, Nigeria</b>