

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_125211
Title of the Manuscript:	Distribution and Implications of Mycobacterium tuberculosis Genotypes in Animals: A Comprehensive Review
Type of the Article	Review

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 '**lack 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 (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	The paper tried to present important concepts on M. tuberculosis in animals. This article has concepts that will contribute for the scientific community. My opinion is to modify the article to the standard of the readers.	
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 the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Abstract lacks standard format and contents to be included	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Needs major modifications	
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.	The scientific papers needs correction	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	No, the paper should explicitly include scientific evidences from the recent findings	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	No, it needs correction	
Optional/General comments	The paper contain valuable concepts for the reader. The review also needs correction. If the authors re-write and include comments given its contribution is significant.	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Getahun Asebe
Department, University & Country	Gambella University, Ethiopia