

**Review Form 3**

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

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> 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>
<p><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></p>	<p>The manuscript "<i>Hidden Threat: Unmasking Silent Spreaders in Dogs for Better Tick-borne Disease Management</i>" is highly valuable for the scientific community as it addresses the critical but often neglected role of asymptomatic dogs(stray dogs) in the transmission of tick-borne diseases. By focusing on these silent carriers, the research provides insight into a hidden aspect of disease ecology that could lead to more effective detection, prevention, and control strategies. I find this manuscript particularly compelling because it sheds light on an underexplored avenue of disease management and preventing outbreaks from unrecognized sources.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>In my opinion, it is quite good, but I can't find the exact connection with the entire manuscript. You might want to review the title again and make it more cohesive.  "Accurate Diagnosis of Tick-Borne Diseases in Working Dogs: The Impact of Unseen Risk Factors"</p>	
<p><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></p>	<p>Place and Duration of Study can be include in Methodology section of abstract. If you have not conclusive reason why male dogs had a higher, though not statistically significant, infection rate than females then you should delete from abstract. Additionally, revise the conclusion to be more concise, creative, and informative, and correct the spelling of 'preventative' to 'preventive'.   <b>Delete 'male dogs had a higher, though not statistically significant, infection rate than females then you should delete from abstract.'</b></p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p><b>Yes the arrangement of manuscript is very good.</b></p>	
<p><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></p>	<p>This manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness and technical soundness through its rigorous methodology and thorough analysis. The study design is well-structured, with clear and appropriate methods for data collection and analysis. The authors provide a comprehensive review of relevant literature, which supports their findings and contextualizes their results within the broader field. Additionally, the statistical analyses are performed correctly, and the conclusions drawn are well-supported by the data presented. Overall, the manuscript's attention to detail and adherence to scientific standards contribute to its credibility and reliability.</p>	
<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>I did not find a citation in the second sentence of the introduction. If it pertains to the first or fourth sentences, it should link these sentences with appropriate connecting words.  If there is any research data available on stray dog infestations with blood parasites, particularly Babesia, in this area, it would be excellent to include it. Since Babesia is mentioned several times in the manuscript, having recorded data on this topic would be highly valuable   <b>The transmission and distribution of these vectors and pathogens are closely linked to regional variations in temperature, rainfall, and humidity. In India, the most common ticks on dogs are <i>Rhipicephalus sanguineus sensu lato</i>, followed by <i>R. haemaphysaloides</i>, <i>R.microplus</i> <i>Haemaphysalis longicornis</i> and <i>H.bispinosa</i>.</b></p>	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The article meets the criteria for technical terminology, grammar, syntax, and professionalism. Therefore, its language and English quality are likely suitable for scholarly communication.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	In the sample collection section of the Materials and Methods, please explain why 1 ml of blood was chosen for analysis and provide a reference to support this choice.  'we collected 1 ml blood samples from 39 dogs in EDTA tubes for hematological analysis and DNA extraction, as well as 1 ml in clot activator tubes for serum biochemical analysis.'	

### **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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Roshan Raj Bahadur Singh Thakuri</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Purbanchal University, Nepal Polytechnic Institute, Nepal</b>