

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_127124
Title of the Manuscript:	Clinical Management of Sarcoptic Mange in Deoni Calf: A Case Report
Type of the Article	Case report

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of „**Jack of Novelty**“, provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/> Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

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</i>
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>Mange is a disease with great economic and welfare implications in domesticated food animals (eg cattle, pigs, goats, rabbits) and non-food animals (dogs, cats). Economically the disease causes retardation of growth due to poor feeding as the animal spends too much time scratching therefore weaning age, slaughter weights are all delayed and market sell price are reduced. Also, mange infestation cause suffering to the animals due to itching, pruritus, erythema hence raises animal welfare concerns. Moreover, mange infestation is one of the stubborn disease to treat and despite available treatment measures the disease continues to prevail. Therefore any manuscript reporting the mange case, effective treatment protocol and prognosis will be of great scientific importance.</p> <p>Therefore the current manuscript is scientifically importance because</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It shows the existence of sarcoptic mange infestation in the particular farm and particular area 2. It shares a treatment protocol which was successful in curing the disease hence can be adopted elsewhere 	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title is brief and informative, however, to my opinion; the locality/region/or country where the case was attended should be added on the title.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstracts is not comprehensive enough because;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It should have briefly indicated the locality where the case was attended 2. Treatment duration is missing 3. Recovery duration is missing 4. Concluding statement is missing 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The manuscript subsections have been well articulated though there are some key missing information.</p> <p>The missing information in the author's manuscript are as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Information showing deworming and acaricides application for helminths and ectoparasites management. That should have been asked from the farm owner 2. The herd size holding the sick animal is not indicated. Indication of herd size is important because epidemiologically mange is highly infectious and can affect as many animals as possible in the herd. 3. If only one calf from a group of animals is affected then that could be due to immune suppression. 4. The treatment protocol reported in the case report was effective in treating the mange infested animals, however I consider the treatment to be inadequate as the mange will re infect the calf. 5. Adequate treatment for mange involves disinfecting the shelter as well to prevent re-infection 	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>Considering the impact of Mange infestation on economic base and animal welfare any manuscript showing innovative and successful diagnosis and treatment protocol of the disease is scientifically commendable. The current manuscript reports on the presence of mange infestation and procedures involved for its diagnosis and treatment protocol. The shared information is pertinent as the reported diagnosis and treatment protocol can be adopted elsewhere.</p> <p>Moreover, as a case report, the manuscript has been well written following all the techniques of study case reporting although there are deficiency to be corrected as follows;</p>	

Review Form 3

	<p>management. That should have been asked from the farm owner</p> <p>2. The herd size holding the sick animal is not indicated. Indication of herd size is important because epidemiologically mange is highly infectious and can affect as many animals as possible in the herd.</p> <p>3. If only one calf from a group of animals is affected then that could be due to immune suppression.</p> <p>4. The treatment protocol reported in the case report was effective in treating the mange infested animals; however I consider the treatment measures to be inadequate as the mites will re infect the calf.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>☐ Reference section is okay</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language is okay and enough for scholarly communications</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript should be accepted upon corrected of shown deficiencies</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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Lusekelo Msomba Mwangengwa
Department, University & Country	University of Agriculture, Tanzania