

Reviewer A: Comments

1. Relevance of the title to the content of the article

Poor

Remarks

1. Title needs to be rephrased

Suggested topic: The investigation of the efficacy of the drug DDI-10 against infection of young chicks by Newcastle Disease

Response: As per Reviewer A suggestion title has been modified as below

The investigation of the efficacy of the prodrug DDI-10 against Newcastle disease virus infection in young chicken.

2. Is DDI-10 a phosphorylated derivative with ethylene diamine component? A structure would make it easier to understand

Response: The synthesis procedure and structures are presented in our earlier publication; therefore we shall not included it in this paper. Hence reference was cited in the manuscript.

3. Introduction: Presentation of the subject, justification of the problem, objectives, hypotheses and methodological foundation, exposing the subject in an orderly and detailed manner

Poor

Remarks

1. Problem poorly outlined

2. To what extent are the NDV disease-causing losses to farmers? This should be mentioned in the introduction, not in the discussion

Response: The paragraph that has been addressed in discussion was incorporated in introduction in the revised manuscript.

3. What are the remedies that are in existence for the disease, other than didanosine (DDI)?

Response: So far there is no specific treatment available for NDV treatment. Antibiotics are recommended to prevent secondary infections (antibiotic doesn't affect viruses). Vaccination and sanitation measures are followed as a preventive measures.

6. The article is mainly about the compound DD10. Therefore, the structure of the compound DD10, along with a brief explanation of the previous finding on the biological activity of the compound summarized clearly in this article

Response: This current manuscript is continuation of our earlier published article. The antiviral activity of the novel phosphorylated compound has been extensively discussed in the published article, therefore it has been cited here.

4. Methodology: Describes the procedure, methods and techniques used in data collection and analysis.

Good

Remarks

1. What is PBS, DNTB

Response: The full forms have been expanded in the revised manuscript. DNTB was typo error, corrected as DNTB and full form has been included.

2. Give a full name of a compound, and its abbreviation, when you first introduce it. Then use the abbreviation only, later use abbreviation throughout the whole article.

Response: As per reviewer A suggestion, abbreviations presented in the study was expanded.

3. NADPH is not a buffer, make the correction

Response: The mistake has been modified and corrected in the revised manuscript as per suggestion.

7. Discussion: They present a level of critical analysis in correspondence with the problem presented. Purposes of the article, scope, support theory and proposed methodological design.

Poor

Remarks

1. Ideas in the first two pages of the discussion could be summarized and incorporated in the Introduction, this would clearly outline the problem being solved by this research

Response: In this revised manuscript the suggestion were incorporated and modified as per suggestion.

2. The discussion must be focusing on the findings of the project, and implications, rather than discussing at length the problem being solved.

Response: As per suggestion discussion in the manuscript was corrected.

9. References. Quality of bibliographic references and if they are in accordance with the Vancouver format.

Regular

Remarks

Where possible the web addresses of the websites for the journals could be provided

Response: As per suggestion DOI has been provided in the references.

11. Contributions. What are the main weaknesses of the manuscript and how the author can do to improve it

1. The problem was not clearly defined in the introduction, and some ideas for the introduction were placed in the discussion.

Response: In the revised manuscript these were corrected and presented.

1. A few grammatical mistakes were highlighted

Response: These were considered and corrected.

2. The title needs to be rephrased

Response: The title was rephrased by incorporating the suggested title by Reviewer A.

Reviewer B: Comments

2. Summary: Presents the general idea of the topic, objectives, research methods, results and conclusions, written in an objective and concise manner; and are found according to the maximum number of words per section.

Regular

Remarks

Avoid the use of numbers. The abstract format must be structured, since it is an original article according to the instructions to the authors.

Response: Abstract has been modified to suit to the instructions to the author as per reviewer B comments.

4. Methodology: Describes the procedure, methods and techniques used in data collection and analysis.

Good

Remarks

The manuscript must have a paragraph on ethical aspects, as indicated in the instructions to authors. Animal testing is not exempt from that.

Response: A statement on ethical approval was provided in the revised manuscript as per Reviewer B suggestions.

5. Ethical aspects. Does the manuscript have a paragraph on ethical aspects, where it mentions approval by the ethics committee, informed consent, and strict compliance with research ethics?

No

Response: A statement was included in the revised manuscript as per suggestion by Reviewer B.

6. Results: They are presented adequately and it is not redundant with tables or graphs shown.

Regular

Remarks

Avoid redundancies between figures. Figures 3 and 4 can be joined. Figures 5,6,7 and 8 should be joined in the same figure, such as figure 9 format

Response: As per Reviewer B comments Figures 3&4 have been merged.

8. Conclusions: Presents the author's inferences and teachings in relation to the investigated topic, it must correspond to the objectives of the study.

Regular

Remarks

They should be more succinct.

Response: As per suggestion by reviewer B it was modified in the revised manuscript.

9. References. Quality of bibliographic references and if they are in accordance with the Vancouver format.

Poor

Remarks

They are in APA format, the journal uses Vancouver format.

Response: As per comments reference format has been modified.

10. Redaction. Is the manuscript correctly written? Does it contain any spelling or grammar mistakes?

Needs some language corrections

Response: It was rectified in the revised manuscript.