

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Pathogen Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPR_120557
Title of the Manuscript:	Waterborne zoonotic diseases- Indian scenario and antimicrobial resistance: Onehealth approach
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract effectively summarizes the paper. However, consider including more specific results to provide a clearer overview of the findings.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	yes	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Overall, your paper provides a comprehensive and insightful analysis of waterborne zoonotic diseases and antimicrobial resistance in India. It offers valuable recommendations for policy and practice improvements. With some revisions to enhance clarity, structure, and technical detail, the manuscript will be well-positioned to make a significant impact.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. =	yes	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Dear Author,</p> <p>Dear author I provide a detailed review of your paper, highlighting its strengths and offering constructive feedback for improvement.</p> <p>General Comments</p> <p>Your paper addresses a critical and timely public health issue, especially relevant in the post-COVID-19 era. The focus on waterborne zoonotic diseases and antimicrobial resistance (AMR) within the context of the Onehealth approach is well-conceived and offers significant contributions to the field.</p> <p>#### Strengths</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">**Relevance and Timeliness**: The topic is highly relevant, addressing ongoing public health challenges and the increasing importance of zoonotic disease management.**Comprehensive Coverage**: The manuscript covers various aspects, including disease surveillance, public awareness, and policy implications, providing a holistic view of the issue.**Methodological Rigor**: The use of multiple data collection methods, including stakeholder interviews and expert consultations, adds depth and credibility to the study.**Policy Focus**: The discussion on existing policies and the need for improvements is well-articulated, highlighting practical implications. <p>Specific Comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">Abstract<ul style="list-style-type: none">- The abstract effectively summarizes the paper. However, consider including more specific results to provide a clearer overview of the findings.Introduction<ul style="list-style-type: none">- The introduction provides a comprehensive background and effectively sets the stage for the study. It clearly articulates the significance of the research.	

Review Form 3

	<p>3. Objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- The objectives are well-defined and align with the study's goals. They provide a clear roadmap for the research. <p>4. Study Area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- The description of the study areas is thorough. Justifying the selection based on disease prevalence and socio-economic factors strengthens the rationale. <p>5. Methodology</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- The methodology is detailed and appropriate for the study. The use of the "Epicollect app" for data collection is commendable. Including more information on the data analysis methods could enhance this section. <p>6. Results</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- The results are comprehensive but could benefit from clearer structuring and summarization. Consider using subheadings to organize the findings more effectively. Including more figures and tables to summarize data visually would enhance readability. <p>7. Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- The discussion elaborates on the findings well, emphasizing the need for improved testing and public health infrastructure. More detailed policy recommendations and technical aspects of disease monitoring systems would add value. <p>8. Conclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- The conclusion succinctly summarizes the key points and reiterates the importance of integrated disease surveillance and public awareness. Suggesting specific actions for stakeholders could make the conclusion more actionable. <p>Recommendations</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Enhance Visuals:- Incorporate more charts, graphs, and tables to summarize key data points and improve readability.2. Elaborate Technical Details: Provide more detailed descriptions of disease monitoring systems and specific policy recommendations to offer practical insights.3. Improve Clarity: Revise the structure of some sections, particularly the results, for better flow and clarity. <p>Final Comments</p>	
--	---	--

Review Form 3

	Overall, your paper provides a comprehensive and insightful analysis of waterborne zoonotic diseases and antimicrobial resistance in India. It offers valuable recommendations for policy and practice improvements. With some revisions to enhance clarity, structure, and technical detail, the manuscript will be well-positioned to make a significant impact.	
--	--	--

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Raghad Shubbar Jaafar
Department, University & Country	University of Basrah, Iraq