

Review Form 1.8

Journal Name:	International Journal of Pathogen Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPR_120159
Title of the Manuscript:	Detection of aerobic bacterial species causing pneumonia in sheep and goats and their susceptibility to antibiotics in Sudan
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.8

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Is the manuscript important for scientific community? <i>(Please write few sentences regarding this manuscript to justify your answer)</i>	This manuscript addresses an important subject that evaluates causes of pneumonia in small stock. Pneumonia is one of the respiratory disease complexes that negatively affect animal production. When studied in the view of the upsurge of antimicrobial resistance, it sheds more light on the efficacy of the management programs since some of the traits have potential of being transferred to human pathogens.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	The abstract has captured relevant information. However, abbreviations and acronyms should not be allowed in the abstract. Names of all isolates including the key words should be written in full in this section.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<p>Introduction: Kindly ensure that all phrases are spelt correctly. There inadequate citations; each statement included should be cited since it was obtained from a source. The problem should also come out clearly.</p> <p>Every abbreviated phrase should appear in full at first mention with abbreviations in brackets and thereafter in the main text as abbreviations or acrpnyms.</p> <p>Material and methods: "A total of 230 and 90 lungs were collected from 1601,484 slaughtered sheep and goat respectively in Khartoum and Gezira States, Sudan" is not clear.</p> <p>Methods should be briefly highlighted not just leaving it as a citation. Primers would have been presented best on a table. PCR assay not clear. There is need to clarify the primers used for identification of E. coli since they exist in numerous forms.</p> <p>Results:</p> <p>Table 1: Bacteria isolated from lung in Gezira and Khartoum State: this could be best presented graphically as frequencies. Nomenclature of the microbes should be consistent with standard organism listing and in a uniform manner throughout the article.</p> <p>All spelling errors should be corrected</p> <p>Table 2 and 3: This should also be best presented as frequencies. Names of organisms should be correctly written.</p> <p>Discussion: This appears like an extension of results and not discussion.</p>	
Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? <i>(Please write few sentences regarding this manuscript to justify your answer)</i>	Yes, but it requires to be revised so that it can have a good flow	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.		

Review Form 1.8

Minor REVISION comments 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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kenneth Waititu
Department, University & Country	Kenya Institute of Primate Research, Kenya