

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Pathogen Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPR_90867
Title of the Manuscript:	Seroprevalence and Associated Risk factor of Cattle Brucellosis in Al Gadarif state – Eastern Sudan
Type of the Article	Original 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:

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

### 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><b>Original research article which can be published after minor revision/ resubmit is suggested</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Introduction</b>- Adequate</li> <li>• <b>Methodology</b>-Adequate</li> <li>• <b>Results</b>- Adequate</li> <li>• <b>Discussion</b>- Adequate</li> </ul>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<b>Mirror error in grammatical</b>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Title: need to be change as indicated in the manuscript.</li> <li>• Keywords: ok</li> <li>• Abstract: Need to revise.</li> <li>• Materials and methods: need major revision.</li> <li>• Study design/design of experiment: CRD/RBD/cross sectional study/ is not mentioned in the manuscript should be specified.</li> <li>• Sampling/diagnostic test should be elaborated as indicated in the manuscript</li> <li>• Statistical analysis is not mentioned in the manuscript/is Result is accuracy/how you quantify the sampling size &amp; correlated to brucellosis &amp; risk factors should be elaborated</li> <li>• On what basis? Prevalence/seroprevalence of brucellosis in cattle/ why this Rose Bengal Plate/ Test (RBPT)/ c.ELISA/ Milk Ring Test (MRT) used and should be elaborated as indicated in the manuscript</li> <li>• The frequencies of positive and negative samples of three tests for cattle brucellosis in 12 localities?</li> <li>• Tables : not sufficient; Table 3: Association of sex -as a risk factor -with the Seropositive results of cattle brucellosis based on sex in Gadarif state How??? Without statistical analysis mentioning showing non-significant based on what p-value</li> <li>• Results: needs revision</li> <li>• Discussion : justification in support of results as indicated in the manuscripts</li> <li>• Conclusion: needs revision</li> <li>• Reference should be in journal format</li> </ul> <p>The manuscript needs revision. Materials and methods needs to be revision and incorporation as mention below and in the manuscript.</p>	

### 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>	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Tilling Tayo</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>ICAR Research Complex for NEH Region, India</b>