

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Animal and Veterinary Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAVS_91094
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevalence, economic impact analysis and viability of Hydatid cysts in Bovine slaughtered in selected abattoirs within Kaduna metropolis, Nigeria. The title to be recast as explained in the comments below.
Type of the 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:

(<https://www.journalajravs.com/index.php/AJRAVS/editorial-policy>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Title: Economic impact analysis poses a problem here. The cost of the organs as per the market values is okay. But it must be done in a tabular form with indices if need be. But using weight loss as an indicator of economic losses resulting from echinococcosis (hydatidosis) is completely not visible, and unacceptable at international fora. Because there are lots of causes of weight loss in cattle that have nothing to do with the disease condition in focus. Most times, mixed infections do cause considerable weight loss in cattle.</p> <p>Abstract: The abstract section wasn't written as per the journal style of sub-sections or divisions into aim, methodology, results, and conclusion.</p> <p>No anybody score condition table was presented either in the materials and methods section or in the results section as mentioned in the abstract section.</p> <p>SPSS: Statistical Product and Service Solutions. This isn't necessary as an abbreviated group of words if the statistical tool section is fully written out as per the journal standard.</p> <p>Keywords: It is in order.</p> <p>Introduction: Corrections to be carried out are in red ink and accompanied by comments.</p> <p>All the sections in the text are supposed to be in capital letters as per the journal style and the previously published manuscripts.</p> <p>Echinococcosis is a name of a disease condition and not botanical name. So, it doesn't deserves capital E when written in the middle of the text except starting a sentence with it.</p> <p>Materials and Methods: It is stated cows were slaughtered. Was it only cows or cattle as stated elsewhere? Clarity is needed here.</p> <p>The age, sex, and body count score parameters were not in the results section as mentioned here. Or the parameters weren't used at all as the information was obtained via the questionnaires?</p> <p>Two or more sentences weren't clear enough or a bit longer to be divided into two. It is stated in the text.</p> <p>Statistical Tool Section: It isn't written at all.</p> <p>Results: Each table is to be followed by a summary of the results for ease of understanding and per international standards. And the results section is to be sub-numbered as per each parameter carried out.</p> <p>In Table 1, No positive isn't standard. It could be misinterpreted wrongly or differently from the author's intention. It should have been No. of Positive or Number of Positive.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

	<p>Other corrections are made in the text.</p> <p>Discussion: Discussion with relevant references was okay. But the discussion based on the two different tables of the results should have been in separate paragraphs instead of one.</p> <p>A few grammatical errors were corrected.</p> <p>Other clarifications sought to be made in the text were asked or indicated.</p> <p>Conclusion: This isn't a conclusion. The conclusion focuses on the main point(s) or salient findings of the research outcome. These are recommendations to minimize the transmission of the disease condition (hydatidosis transmission).</p> <p>Conclusion to be written.</p> <p>The word or group of words in red ink indicates corrections to be made.</p> <p>The word or group of words in blue ink indicate corrections suggested by the peer-reviewer.</p> <p>The word or group of words in yellow ink indicate the comments made by the peer-reviewer to be carried out.</p> <p>Reference List. Only two corrections in red ink are to be done here as indicated in the text.</p> <p>Other references were written as per the journal style and in order. Only two corrections in red ink are to be done here as indicated in the text.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The research work carried out is good both for animals and humans health. And for the preventive measures, too. The manuscript could be published after the corrections are done.</p>	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

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