



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Immunology</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJI_52193</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Haematological Assessments of Cocos nucifera Linn. Water and Oil on Apparently Healthy Wistar Albino Rats.</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>Dear authors, congratulations on your work. I wish the authors a good chance of article being published, but it will be necessary to review and score issues that may improve the quality of the manuscript.</p> <p><b>Abstract</b> - must be as requested by the magazine. - if it is possible to further reduce the methodology to speak more of the most promising results of the study.</p> <p><b>Introduction</b> - The introduction should be broadened by addressing why coconut would be important in hematological indicators. This is not addressed. - The authors should detail if the literature talks about this relationship between coconut and the hematological indicators. - The authors should describe the importance of this study.</p> <p><b>Methodology</b> - Authors don't describe why they used and chose wistar rats and not others. - The methodology is insufficient and poor in detail. - Ethical aspects related to animal experimentation are not mentioned.</p> <p><b>Results and discussion</b>  - There is no table with the main characteristics of the study population. - The findings are weak evidence due to the lack of detail in the methodology. - The findings and conclusions of the study should be improved and detailed.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**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>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Karen Cordovil</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Fiocruz, Brazil</b>