

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Research in Animal and Veterinary Sciences</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJRAVS_106519</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>EFFECTIVENESS AND OUTREACH OF A TWO-YEAR WEEKLY VACCINATION CAMPAIGN AGAINST PPR IN BAGAMATI PROVINCE: A COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Report</b>

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This manuscript is very important for the scientific community because microorganisms are in perpetual genetic evolution to be able to resist antibiotics and vaccines. If the effectiveness of the vaccine has been demonstrated through this campaign, this is synonymous with scientific progress in the service of the social and economic well-being of the Nepalese population in particular and the whole world in general.</li> <li>2. The title of the article is more or less suitable but it can be rephrased as follows; (a): Evaluation of the biennial vaccination campaign against peste des petits ruminants in the Bagamati province in Nepal; or (b): Study of the impact of the biennial vaccination campaign on the prevalence of peste des petits ruminants in the province of Bagamati in Nepal.</li> <li>3. The abstract is comprehensive but has shortcomings in terms of structure. I suggest: (1) reviewing (contracting) the 2nd and 3rd sentences of the summary; (2) insert 1 or 2 sentences of methodology (explaining how the study was carried out); (3) highlight the salient results of the study and (4) remove the penultimate sentence from the abstract.</li> <li>4. I find that the subsection and the structure of the manuscript are not appropriate. A study report or an article always contains: a methodology section (material and method) followed by the results. From the objectives to the excluded conclusion, there is a problem of structure and arrangement of ideas. These parts must be rigorously corrected by the authors.</li> <li>5. I think that the manuscript is scientifically correct.</li> <li>6. The references are sufficient and recent.</li> </ol> <p><b><u>Additional comments and suggestions</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Clinical signs subsection: Review lines 49 and 50.</li> <li>2. Background subsection: Figure 1 is not announced before it appears. It must be announced on lines 85 to 90. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Review line 95.</li> <li>- On figure 1 we have the District of Sindhupalchock and on figure 2 it is written Sindupalchowk. Is this the same district of Bagamati? Please remember the official spelling.</li> <li>- In Figure 3, the names of the provinces are clearly written according to the different colors with their percentage of meat production. Therefore, the legend associated with this figure is no longer useful.</li> <li>- Review line 124.</li> <li>- Objectives sub-section (lines 127 to 130): the report concerns the vaccination campaign in Bagamati Province and not the national program which covers all 7 Provinces of Nepal. Therefore all the objectives must be reviewed.</li> </ul> </li> </ol> <p><b>Subdivision immunization program conducted in fy 2021/22 and fy 2021/22:</b> You can remove lines 133 and 134.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Subsection List 1 (line 136) looks like a study method (methodology).</li> <li>- - The Coverage Report and Vaccination Effectiveness subsections look like results.</li> <li>- - Figure 4 is not announced. Very generally in scientific writing, before arriving at a figure, its appearance is announced.</li> <li>- Subsection Conclusion (from line 207 to line 219): Please review the conclusion. Speak with numerical values. Knowing the size of the goat and sheep herd and the number of animals vaccinated, we can report in order to be able to speak with numerical values. The same goes for breeders whose animals are vaccinated. The last sentence of the conclusion must disappear.</li> </ul> <p>For the conclusion to be improved, it must be a synthesis (summary) of the coverage report part and the vaccination effectiveness part, translated into numerical values.</p>	

## Review Form 1.7

<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language/English of the article is of high quality and suitable for scientific scholarly	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The work is relevant because it concerns animal health, especially small ruminants which play a very important role in the economy of poor households and in food security.	

### **PART 2:**

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

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Oumar Ouattara</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Sciences, Techniques and Technologies of Bamako, Mali</b>