

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Biotechnology Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJI_121640
Title of the Manuscript:	Knowledge, Perception, and Awareness of Dog-related Zoonoses in Uyo Metropolis, Nigeria.
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>

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)
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript is of significant importance to the scientific community as it addresses the crucial issue of zoonotic diseases transmitted from dogs to humans, a topic that is especially relevant in regions with high human-animal interactions. By highlighting the knowledge gaps and risk perceptions among dog owners in Uyo, Nigeria, the study provides valuable insights that can inform public health strategies and veterinary practices. The detailed data on awareness levels and risk factors can help in the formulation of targeted interventions to reduce the incidence of zoonotic infections. I appreciate the manuscript's comprehensive approach and its potential to contribute to improved health outcomes through better understanding and management of zoonotic diseases.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes, the title "Knowledge Perception and Awareness of Dog-related Zoonoses in Uyo Metropolis Nigeria" is suitable. It accurately reflects the content and focus of the study, clearly indicating that the research is about the awareness and perceptions of dog-related zoonotic diseases among residents of Uyo, Nigeria. The title is specific and informative, providing readers with a clear understanding of the study's scope and geographical context.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract of the article is fairly comprehensive but could benefit from some restructuring and additional details to enhance clarity and completeness. Here are my suggestions: Background Context: Briefly introduce the significance of studying dog-related zoonoses. Summarize the implications of the findings and the recommended actions based on the study. Remove redundant phrases or overly detailed statistics that might be better suited for the results section of the main text.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The manuscript has a generally appropriate structure, but there are areas where it can be improved to enhance readability and coherence. Here are some suggestions for subsections and structure:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Suggestion :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduction Background Significance of Study Objectives Materials and Methods <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Study Area and Population Data Collection Statistical Analysis Results <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demographic Characteristics Awareness of Zoonotic Diseases Knowledge on Specific Zoonotic Diseases Awareness of Disease Transmission Veterinary Attention and Feeding Practices 	
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound due to its comprehensive methodology and rigorous data analysis. The use of a well-structured questionnaire and a sizable sample of 200 respondents provides a solid foundation for the study's findings. The statistical analysis using SPSS, including the Fisher exact test, ensures that the results are statistically significant and reliable.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Recency: While some references are recent, such as Adams et al. (2023) and Ahmed et al. (2023), others are relatively old (e.g., references from 1985, 1998, 2001). Incorporating more recent studies will help to ensure that the manuscript reflects the latest research and trends in the field.</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communication other than few grammatical mistakes.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is well-structured and addresses a relevant public health issue.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mian Zahid Sarfraz
Department, University & Country	Allama Iqbal Medical College, Pakistan