

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_123955
Title of the Manuscript:	Hidden threat: Unmasking silent spreaders in dogs for better tick-borne disease management
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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 feedback here)</i>
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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Please make the following corrections.</p> <p>After reviewing the study titled "Hidden threat: Unmasking silent spreaders in dogs for better tick-borne disease management," several notable flaws and areas for improvement stand out:</p> <p>The study only included 39 dogs from a single NDRF unit, which limits the generalizability of the results. A more comprehensive study with a larger sample size across multiple units or regions would provide more robust and widely applicable findings.</p> <p>The study acknowledges the limitations of using microscopy, as no parasites were detected through this method, yet PCR results revealed a high infection rate. Reliance on microscopy, which is known to have lower sensitivity in chronic or subclinical infections, may have skewed the interpretation of early findings.</p> <p>There is no control group of dogs (e.g., dogs from different environments or with different tick control measures) to compare the findings, which would help isolate the specific factors contributing to the high infection rates observed in the NDRF dogs.</p> <p>While the study mentions environmental conditions conducive to tick proliferation, it provides limited concrete data on these environmental factors (e.g., tick density, climate data) that could have further supported the findings regarding tick-borne disease risk.</p> <p>The majority of dogs in the study are Labrador Retrievers, with only a small number of other breeds. This creates potential bias and limits the ability to generalize findings regarding breed susceptibility to tick-borne diseases.</p> <p>Although the study collected epidemiological data (e.g., age, breed, gender, tick exposure), it does not delve into a more detailed analysis of these variables. Further multivariate statistical analysis could strengthen the conclusions regarding risk factors for infection.</p> <p>The study reports no significant abnormalities in most biochemical and hematological parameters, except for a few dogs. However, the clinical implications of these findings are not deeply explored. There is also no follow-up data to indicate whether these subclinical infections later progressed to more severe health issues.</p> <p>The presence of coinfections (e.g., <i>Babesia gibsoni</i> and <i>Ehrlichia canis</i>) is noted, but the clinical significance of these coinfections is not well-explored. Given the complexities of coinfections, more in-depth discussion on their implications for treatment and prognosis would be beneficial.</p> <p>While the study emphasizes the need for better disease management and tick control, it does not provide detailed or novel suggestions for improving current tick prevention practices. It could benefit from more specific recommendations based on the study's findings.</p> <p>Addressing these issues would enhance the clarity and impact of the study's findings, making them more applicable in the broader context of canine tick-borne disease management.</p> <p>You can cite to the following two studies to improve the structure of your study:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Study on prevalence and identification of livestock tick by sex ratio and host in Tehran province.- The impact of climatic and seasonal change on the frequency of livestock ticks in Tehran province, Iran. <p>The study needs a general revision in terms of language and grammar.</p>	

Review Form 3

	Good luck.	
--	------------	--

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:	Ebrahim Abbasi
Department, University & Country	Shiraz University of Medical Sciences, Iran