

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_126733
Title of the Manuscript:	Haemato-Biochemical Analysis, Serum Vitamin A, and Zinc Status in Clinical and Subclinical Oriental Theileriosis in cattle
Type of the Article	Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>
Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript explores haemato-biochemical and micronutrient changes in cattle with Oriental Theileriosis, which is valuable for advancing diagnostic and management strategies for tick-borne diseases in livestock. It adds scientific insight into both clinical and subclinical infections, making it relevant to veterinary and biomedical fields.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title is clear and accurately reflects the content. Consider rephrasing the title to “Haematological and Biochemical Profiles, Including Vitamin A and Zinc Status, in Clinical and Subclinical Oriental Theileriosis in Cattle”, this clarifies profiles and nutrient status evaluated across clinical conditions.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract effectively summarizes the study, though adding practical implications would enhance its appeal.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript is well-organized with clear sections, making it easy to follow.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The study is scientifically robust, with a clear methodology, valid data analysis, and thorough discussion. Findings are well-supported, adding reliability to the manuscript.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	References are relevant and current. Adding a few more on micronutrient roles could enrich the literature review.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is generally suitable, though minor edits would improve clarity and flow.	
Optional/General comments	This study is a meaningful contribution to the field, with valuable implications for managing Theileriosis in livestock.	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Moges Eriso Blate
Department, University & Country	Wolaita Sodo University, Ethiopia