

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_118908
Title of the Manuscript:	Study of haematological and biochemical alterations in clinical cases of canine ehrlichiosis to understand the clinical picture of the disease
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

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

(<https://www.journaljamb.com/index.php/JAMB/editorial-policy>)

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes, this manuscript is important for the scientific community because its results helps the clinicians to improve the diagnostic and the treatment of the canine ehrlichiosis. By presenting the differences between the haematological and biochemical parameters in ehrlichiosis and healthy animals this study contributes to a better understand of the disease.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title is suitable but I would recommend modifying it: instead of "Study of haematological and biochemical alterations in clinical cases of canine ehrlichiosis to understand the clinical picture of the disease" to use "Study of haematological and biochemical changes in clinical cases of canine ehrlichiosis to understand the clinical picture of the disease".</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. Yes, the structure of the manuscript it appropriate.</p> <p>5. From my point of view, the information is scientifically correct and properly structured.</p> <p>6. The references are proper and sufficient. It includes a reasonable number of recent references, but it would have been better if there were more references from the last 5 years.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, from my point of view the English quality of the manuscript is ok but I am not a native English speaker.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I've made all the comments directly on the manuscript.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Alexandru Diana Mihaela
Department, University & Country	University of Agronomic Sciences and Veterinary Medicine, Romania