

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</a>
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 Article

#### 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>

#### 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)
<b>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.</b>	This manuscript provides a comprehensive review of <i>Mycobacterium tuberculosis</i> genotypes in animals, emphasizing the importance of genotyping in controlling tuberculosis under a One Health approach. Its discussion of zoonotic transmission and the need for better diagnostic tools is highly relevant to global public health and veterinary medicine. I appreciate the detailed analysis of the distribution and prevalence of genotypes across species and regions, which highlights critical knowledge gaps. However, while the manuscript is thorough, it could benefit from clearer organization in some sections to enhance readability.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The title of the review article is suitable, if you want to change then choose one. 1. Exploring the Distribution and Zoonotic Impact of <i>Mycobacterium tuberculosis</i> Genotypes in Animals 2. Genotype Distribution of <i>Mycobacterium tuberculosis</i> in Animals: Insights for Zoonotic Control" 3. A One Health Perspective on <i>Mycobacterium tuberculosis</i> Genotypes in Animals: Distribution and Implications"	
<b>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.</b>	The abstract is comprehensive, covering the main aspects of the review, such as the distribution of <i>Mycobacterium tuberculosis</i> genotypes in animals, the use of genotyping methods, and the implications for tuberculosis control. However, it could be improved by briefly mentioning specific animal species affected and a more detailed explanation of the One Health approach. Including a statement on the potential impact on public health and veterinary strategies would also strengthen the abstract. No major deletions are necessary.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate, as they effectively organize the key topics, such as genotyping methods, transmission dynamics, and the distribution of <i>Mycobacterium tuberculosis</i> in various animals. Each section is well-defined and contributes to the overall flow of the review. However, a more logical progression from background information to specific findings might improve readability, such as discussing the One Health approach earlier in the manuscript. Minor reorganization could enhance the clarity and impact of the content.	
<b>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.</b>	The manuscript appears scientifically robust and technically sound, as it is based on established genotyping methods like spoligotyping, MIRU-VNTR, and whole genome sequencing, all of which are well-validated for studying <i>Mycobacterium tuberculosis</i> . It accurately highlights the importance of understanding strain diversity and transmission dynamics in animals, aligning with current scientific knowledge. Additionally, the review's focus on zoonotic transmission and its public health implications shows a thorough understanding of the One Health approach, further reinforcing its scientific correctness.	

**Review Form 3**

<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p> <p>-</p>	<p>The references provided in the manuscript are generally sufficient and relevant, covering key topics like genotyping methods and zoonotic transmission of <i>Mycobacterium tuberculosis</i>. However, some references could be more recent to reflect the latest advancements in diagnostic tools and genomic studies. Including newer research on whole genome sequencing or emerging molecular diagnostic technologies could strengthen the manuscript. No major omissions were noted, but updating a few older references might enhance its relevance.</p>	
<p><u>Minor REVISION</u> comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language quality of the article is generally suitable for scholarly communication, as it uses appropriate scientific terminology and maintains clarity throughout. However, some sentences could be refined for smoother flow and readability. Minor grammatical adjustments and rephrasing in certain sections would enhance its overall presentation, but the current language is adequate for a scholarly audience.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The manuscript provides a valuable and timely review of <i>Mycobacterium tuberculosis</i> in animals, with a focus on genotyping and zoonotic transmission. It is well-structured and addresses important aspects of the topic. However, improving the flow between sections and updating a few references could further strengthen its impact. Clarifying some points in the abstract and enhancing the language in certain areas will improve readability and scholarly appeal. Overall, the manuscript makes a strong contribution to the field.</p>	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>Tasawar Iqbal</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>Institute of Physiology and Pharmacology, University of Agriculture Faisalabad, Pakistan</b></p>