

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE &amp; Health</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJTDH_110375</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>“STUDY ON MAJOR CAUSES OF ORGAN CONDEMNATION AND ECONOMIC SIGNIFICANCE IN CAMELS SLAUGHTERED AT JIGJIGA MUNICIPAL ABATTOIR, ETHIOPIA.</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**Review Form 1.7**

**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><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>	<p>I have read through the paper. It is technically sound but requires improvement on English language. As it is, readers will find it difficult to follow and understand. For ease of reference during review the manuscript should have a continuous line numbers.</p> <p><b>Abstract</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Title: Propose to add the aspect of time to the title; "STUDY ON MAJOR CAUSES OF ORGAN CONDEMNATION AND ECONOMIC SIGNIFICANCE IN CAMELS SLAUGHTERED AT JIGJIGA MUNICIPAL ABATTOIR – ETHIOPIA August, 2021."</li> <li>2. Separate the geographic location from the rest of the title by an em dash as in comment 1 above.</li> <li>3. Consider to include one or two sentences on the public importance of study. Why did you do the study and what was the main problem?</li> <li>4. I suggest that the abstract be written in a structured way, with the following sub-heading; Background, Methods, Results and conclusion. Each of the sub-heading typed flush left, in bold font and followed by a colon</li> </ol> <p><b>Manuscript Main body</b></p> <p><b>Introduction/background</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Describe clearly the purpose of the study, the problem being evaluated and the objectives of the study</li> </ol> <p><b>Methods</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Study population – first paragraph; check English language. Camels slaughtered at Jigjiga municipal abattoir came from different sources, including; xxxxxxx</li> <li>2. In paragraph 2 and all through the manuscript; Check for spelling mistakes, correct – rondon</li> <li>3. Study design - Re-write for clarity. Was it really a cross sectional study? Authors are describing a prospective longitudinal study. There were weekly visits from March to August. 4 visits were made per week out of the 7 slaughter day. This is more of a follow up/longitudinal study</li> <li>4. Sample size calculation – Authors wrote that they had 384 from the formula and added 48 animals to maximise accuracy and increase precision level. How was the figure of 48 arrived at?</li> <li>5. Economic loss analysis – Did authors use an average price per unit weight of the organ? Was the price uniform across the butchers interviewed?</li> </ol> <p><b>Results</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The results on ante-mortem findings – is it really necessary to include in the manuscript? The study is about Causes of organ condemnation and associated economic losses. The authors report that all the abnormalities were considered mild and the animals were approved for slaughter!</li> </ol>	

**Review Form 1.7**

	<p>2. For overall prevalence and all through the manuscript/result section, what was the denominator.? Authors presented a proportion with the numerator only.</p> <p>3. Improve on the appearance of the table, align the title with the content of the column.</p> <p>4. Consider combining some of the tables with similar results (The animal demographics such as age, sex and origin can be combined with prevalence of organ condemnation to avoid repetition). Table 8 would have served the purpose intended for Table 3,4,5,6 and 7.</p> <p><b>Discussion</b></p> <p>1. It appears there are enough studies related to the topic. The authors should just focus on the main findings and elaborate on them and may be explain why their results concur or disagree with other related studies.</p> <p>2. Why was this study important? What was new knowledge that the authors want to communicate?</p> <p><b>Conclusion/Recommendation</b></p> <p>1. The conclusion and recommendations are not based on the data presented in the result section</p> <p>2. Authors wrote, "Lack of knowledge about the diseases caused by organs to condemn and economic impact. Inappropriate disposal of abattoir materials were sustained the occurrence of the disease in the study area". Was there any result to conclude on the fact that inappropriate disposal of abattoir materials led to the sustained occurrence of the disease?</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Boku Bodha</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>Kenya</b></p>