Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**Microbiology Research Journal International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_MRJI_107901**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Detection of Crimean Congo Haemorrhagic Fever virus markers in ticks in Upper Guinea-Republic of Guinea.**
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.7

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 **1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?** (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. **Is the title of the article suitable?** (If not please suggest an alternative title) **3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?** **4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** **5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?** **6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	**Abstract:** It lacks sufficient information on the study methodology, sample size, and statistical analysis. The abstract mentions that 578 ticks were collected and divided into 254 pools, but it does not specify the details of the sampling design or the geographical locations from where the ticks were collected. In order to generalize the findings to the natural region of Upper Guinea, it is essential to provide information about the representativeness of the tick samples and the areas they were collected from. Furthermore, the abstract mentions the use of two analysis methods, RT-PCR and ELISA, but it does not describe their sensitivity and specificity, which are critical for assessing the accuracy of the results. Without these details, it is challenging to evaluate the reliability of the molecular and serological tests used to detect the Crimean Congo haemorrhagic fever virus. The abstract also reports low positive case rates (0.8% for RT-PCR and 0.4% for ELISA) without mentioning any confidence intervals or statistical significance testing. Without this information, it is difficult to determine the precision and reliability of these results. Additionally, the abstract does not clarify whether the positive cases were detected in the same tick pools or if they were from different pools, which may impact the interpretation of the findings. **Introduction:** it lacks a clear and organized structure. The paragraph jumps between different historical events and the discovery of the virus without providing a smooth transition. The introduction should provide a clear background on Crimean Congo haemorrhagic fever (CCHF), its transmission, and the significance of the virus before delving into historical details and recent cases. The information provided needs to be better organized and presented in a logical sequence. Additionally, the introduction heavily relies on citations from Bente et al. (2013), Hoogstraal (1979), and Whitehouse (2004) to support the historical account. While referencing authoritative sources is important, the introduction should also include a broader review of relevant literature to provide a comprehensive overview of the current understanding of CCHF. The inclusion of recent studies, epidemiological data, and advancements in CCHF research would strengthen the introduction. It is also worth noting that the introduction does not provide a clear statement of the research objective or the specific focus of the study. It briefly mentions the recent case in Mauritania, but it does not connect this case to the rest of the introduction or provide any context of how it relates to the study that will be discussed. **Methodology:** Methodology is the lack of detail regarding the study design and sampling strategy. The methodology states that it was a prospective and descriptive study conducted at the Institut de Recherche en Biologie Appliquée de Guinée (IRBAG) from June to December 2022. However, it does not specify the specific aims or objectives of the study and how the study was designed to address those objectives. Additionally, there is no information provided on the sampling method used to collect the tick pools. Details such as the locations, number of sites, and sampling	

	technique would help assess the representativeness of the samples and the generalizability of the findings. The description of the biomaterial being tick pools is vague and lacks information on how the tick pools were obtained and processed. It is important to provide information on the collection method, species identification, and any measures taken to ensure the integrity of the tick pools for accurate analysis. Without these details, it is difficult to assess the reliability and accuracy of the biomaterial used in the study. The methodology mentions that enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA) and molecular RT-PCR were used to search for markers of the virus. However, it does not provide any details on the specific protocols or procedures employed for these techniques. It is crucial to include information on the types of ELISA and RT-PCR assays used, as well as any validation procedures and controls followed to ensure the accuracy of the results. **Discussion:** It lacks a thorough analysis and interpretation of the results in relation to the research question or objective stated in the introduction. The discussion mainly focuses on comparing the findings of the current study with previous studies conducted in different regions (Guinea, Iran, West Africa, and Spain) without directly addressing the implications of these comparisons. Instead of critically discussing the reasons for the differences observed in prevalence rates between the current study and previous studies, the discussion merely states that the results from other studies are higher or lower than the current study. There is no attempt to explain the potential factors contributing to these variations, such as differences in tick species, geographical locations, sampling methods, or laboratory techniques. Providing a critical analysis of these factors would help understand the context and potential limitations of the findings. Furthermore, the discussion only briefly mentions that Rhipicephalus geigyi was identified as the main vector and reservoir of the pathogen in Upper Guinea without elaborating on the implications of this finding. There is no discussion on the ecological significance or potential public health implications of this particular tick species being the main carrier. Additionally, no reference is made to any existing literature or previous studies supporting or contradicting this finding. **References:** please follow the guidelines of the Journal for ref. Section.	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**		
Optional/General comments		

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)*	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Mahmoud Mokhtar Abd El Kader Moustafa**
Department, University & Country	**Benha University, Egypt**