

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Immunology |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJI_95999 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Antigenic Detection of Mycobacterium bovis in Fresh and Fermented Milk Sold in Gombe Metropolis, Nigeria |
| 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.journalaji.com/index.php/AJI/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) |
|--|---|---|
| <p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p> | <p>1- Yes.</p> <p>2- Yes.</p> <p>3- Yes.</p> <p>4- Yes.</p> <p>5- - Summarizes well explanatory. - Clear and explanatory introduction regarding the pathology caused by the bacteria under study and reporting the types of techniques used. - Objective of the study well defined. - Explanatory methodology and easy understanding of the techniques used. - Table 1, 2, 3 with correct data - I did not observe the data and statistics comparing the test in fresh and fermented milk, only reported in the discussion. - Conclusion is in line with the objective.</p> <p>6-- Yes.</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | <p>- I advise you to put the statistical data between fresh and fermented milk in the results.</p> | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | <p>Important work for public health and alerting the areas responsible for health surveillance control in the country.</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) |
|--|---|---|
| <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> | |

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name: | Fabiano Rito Macedo |
| Department, University & Country | State University of Amazonas, Brazil |