SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Advances in Microbiology**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JAMB_54741**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Overdose Administration of Thermostable Newcastle Disease Vaccines to Naïve Unvaccinated 6 Weeks Old Cockerels at NVRI, Vom Plateau state, Nigeria**
Type of the Article	**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:

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

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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	**I think there is a need for the authors to make known the justification for this study and why overdose vaccination was carried out** **How did you decide this claim of harmlessness in birds and handlers?** **Did you check the antibody levels before the experiment? What was the vaccination history of the experimental birds?** **What about the embryonated eggs? Were there sourced from ND vaccination –free flocks?** **As all these may possibly play some roles in the outcome** **If I may ask, have you considered possible toxicities as a result of the overdose. May be blood analysis and or serum biochemistry may answer that?** **Mere physical observation of the birds may not give a conclusion on their safety or health status**	The manuscript has been thoroughly modified and revised
Minor REVISION comments	Please check the manuscripts for other corrections and comment	
Optional/General comments	The conclusion written cannot be derived from the experimental study, as such some research gaps need to be filled to do that	

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	