

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Microbiology Research Journal International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_MRJI_121689</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Prevalence study of Bovine Brucellosis in Meghalaya: North-East State of India</b>
Type of the 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>
<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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This manuscript is of significant importance to the scientific community as it provides a comprehensive assessment of bovine brucellosis prevalence in Meghalaya, a region with limited prior data.</li> <li>2. By employing both serological tests and the Milk Ring Test, the study offers a detailed evaluation of infection rates and associated risk factors, contributing valuable insights into disease dynamics in a unique geographical and socio-economic context. The use of multiple diagnostic methods provides a robust and comprehensive assessment of the disease's prevalence and distribution.</li> <li>3. The findings highlight critical areas for targeted intervention and inform control strategies, which can aid in mitigating brucellosis outbreaks in similar settings. This work is vital for informing both local and global health strategies, improving disease management, and advancing our understanding of zoonotic diseases in diverse ecological settings.</li> <li>4. Additionally, the study underscores the need for continued surveillance and research, enhancing our understanding of brucellosis in the hilly and tribal regions of India and potentially influencing public health policies and animal husbandry practices.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p><b>Alternative Title Suggestion:</b> Prevalence of Bovine Brucellosis in Meghalaya: A Study of the North-East State of India</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>The abstract structure is comprehensive with clear and concise summary of the study. However, the author needs to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ensure that the terms used for tests are consistent throughout. For example, the abstract uses "RBPT" and "iELISA" but does not explicitly define them here. Make sure that these abbreviations are defined at their first occurrence in the manuscript.</li> <li>2. The abstract states that the indirect ELISA revealed a serum positivity of 9.89% and the RBPT detected 9.33%. Yet, the text later notes that 287 samples (8.98%) were positive by both tests. Ensure that these numbers align with the results presented in the main text and are consistently reported.</li> <li>3. Discuss the broader impact of your findings. This could involve implications for public health, policy changes, future research, or practical applications in agriculture or veterinary practices.</li> <li>4. Do clarify either to use with serosurveillance study or serological test for RBPT and iELISA.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>The overall structure and subsections of your manuscript appear appropriate for a scientific paper with minor correction.</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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound due to its comprehensive methodology and rigorous data analysis.</li> <li>2. This study utilized multiple diagnostic techniques, including the Rose Bengal Plate Test (RBPT), indirect ELISA, and the Milk Ring Test (MRT), ensuring a thorough evaluation of bovine brucellosis prevalence. Therefore, the use of these established and validated methods enhances the reliability of the findings.</li> <li>3. Moreover, the manuscript includes detailed descriptions of sampling procedures, testing</li> </ol>	

**Review Form 3**

	<p>protocols, and statistical analysis, which contribute to the study's transparency and reproducibility.</p> <p>4. The author provides a robust framework for understanding and managing the disease in Meghalaya by addressing various aspects of brucellosis prevalence and risk factors in a systematic way.</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>=</p>	<p>References are insufficient and the format is not standardized. Suggest to use "Harvard Referencing" style for each reference. Ensure all references are up-to- date and relevant. Double-check citation formatting and completeness.</p> <p><b>Suggestion of additional references:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. OIE Terrestrial Manual (2018). Bovine Brucellosis. Chapter 2.4.3</li> <li>2. Lindahl, E., &amp; Sattorov, N. (2022). <i>Journal of Clinical Microbiology</i>, 60(4), e01242-21.</li> <li>3. Regasa, F., Mekonnen, D., &amp; Abunna, F. (2021). Sero-prevalence and associated risk factors of bovine brucellosis in Sendafa, Oromia Special Zone surrounding Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. <i>PLOS ONE</i>, 16(2), e0246303.</li> <li>4. Rahman, A., et al. (2022). "Vaccination Strategies for Brucellosis Control in Endemic Regions." <i>Journal of Veterinary Science and Technology</i>, 14(2), 145-159.</li> <li>5. Karthik, K., et al. (2023). "Application of Real-time PCR for the Diagnosis of Brucellosis in Cattle." <i>Veterinary Microbiology</i>, 265, 109357</li> </ol>	

**Review Form 3**

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes, the language quality is suitable for scholarly communications. It is clear, concise, and appropriately formal. This manuscript is well-suited for publication with minor correction on the grammar, clarity and overall flow.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The methods are detailed and comprehensive, including sample collection, serological tests, and data analysis. Still:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Can consider adding a section on the statistical methods used for data analysis, including how significance was tested.</li> </ol> <p>The results section is detailed and presents data from different tests and categories effectively. However,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It might be helpful to include tables or figures to visually represent the prevalence rates and comparative data for clarity.</li> <li>2. The author should be precise about the context and conditions that might affect the comparison when comparing the results with other studies.</li> </ol> <p>The discussion provides a good comparison with other studies and highlights key findings related to risk factors and prevalence. Nevertheless, the discussion structure can be strengthened by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. linking your findings more clearly to the potential implications for public health and livestock management in Meghalaya.</li> <li>2. Address any limitations of your study more clearly and suggest areas for future research.</li> </ol> <p>Ensure consistent use of terminology and data reporting throughout the manuscript. For instance, standardize how prevalence rates and percentages are presented.</p> <p>Incorporate tables and figures where possible to make the data more accessible and visually engaging.</p> <p>There is some repetition in discussing the prevalence rates and comparative performance of RBPT and iELISA.</p> <p>Addressing these points would improve the clarity and depth of the discussion, making the findings and their implications more understandable.</p>	

**PART 2:**

	<p><b>Reviewer's comment</b></p>	<p><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>
<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>	

**Review Form 3**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Thenamutha Muniandy</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Malaysia</b>