

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Microbiology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMB_122310</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>EPIDEMIOLOGY AND EMERGENCE OF GENOTYPE XIII.2.2 OF CLASS II NEWCASTLE DISEASE VIRUS FROM VACCINATED FLOCKS IN KERALA</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Research Article</b>

#### **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**

<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 is significant for the scientific community as it signifies the emergence of a new virulent genotype of Newcastle Disease Virus (NDV), genotype XIII.2.2, in vaccinated poultry flocks in Kerala. The outcomes of research are particularly significant, as it suggests the insufficiency of the current vaccines against evolving NDV Strains. It also emphasize the need for the development of new vaccines. This study combines the epidemiological, molecular, and phylogenetic analyses, thus providing the valuable insights into the hurdles of controlling NDV. It also contributes to the broader understanding of evolution of virus in poultry. I appreciate this manuscript for its detailed analysis and its inferences for improving disease management and prevention strategies in the poultry industry.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>The current title is also suitable, but in my opinion the revised title "Emergence of Genotype XIII.2.2 Newcastle Disease Virus in Vaccinated Poultry Flocks: An Epidemiological and Phylogenetic Study from Kerala" I think that this new title also highlights the epidemiological and phylogenetic analysis.</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>Generally, it is comprehensive but I suggest following modifications for enhanced clarity and impact on the reader.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In objectives and significance; Addition of the one sentence, about how the emergence of this genotype could affect poultry health and vaccination strategies, would enhance the context.</li> <li>2. Result section is vibrant but can be clearer by mentioning the number of isolates or samples analysed, rather than just percentage of positive flocks.</li> <li>3. Conclusion can be strengthened by concisely mentioning the steps for future research or practical recommendations for the poultry industry.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>They are well structured and covers essential aspects, but I suggest following improvements;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In introduction, more focus should be on the background, the gap in existing knowledge and specific objectives of the research.</li> <li>2. In Material and methods, consider breaking in categories such as a) Sample collection and Epidemiological Data b) Molecular Identification c) Sequencing and Phylogenetic Analysis.</li> </ol>	
<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>The manuscript is scientifically robust because of the inclusiveness of the general approach and the rigorous analysis. RT-PCR is targeted to the F gene of NDV, a well-used and dependable technique in molecular identification, and it ensures proper detection of the virus. The phylogenetic analysis of isolated strains, utilizing MEGA11 software and multiple sequence alignments, provides a thorough comparison with known vaccine strains and enhances the study's credibility. Additionally, the detailed epidemiological data, such as seasonal patterns and vaccination status, offer huge plus-point in the explanation on dynamics of outbreaks and implications of control strategies. Thus, the manuscript's careful approach to sampling, analysis, and interpretation underscores its scientific validity and contribution to understanding NDV epidemiology.</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>Yes majority of the references are recent and sufficient, in my opinion.</p>	

### 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>The language and English quality of the manuscript are generally suitable for scholarly communication. But;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Avoid overly complex sentences that might obscure meaning. For example, the phrase "significant antigenic and phylogenetic difference between vaccines and circulating virulent NDV strains" could be simplified for clarity.</li><li>2. Maintain consistency in terminology and style throughout the manuscript. For instance, ensure that terms like "NDV" and "Newcastle Disease Virus" are used consistently and defined upon first use.</li><li>3. Phrases such as "molecular detection of NDV of collected samples" could be revised for clarity, e.g., "molecular detection of NDV in collected samples."</li><li>4. Consider adding brief explanations or definitions for complex terms when first introduced.</li></ol>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>To further enhance the manuscript, consider improving the clarity and quality of figures and tables, and provide additional context by comparing findings with global research. Discussing study limitations, practical implications, and suggesting future research directions would strengthen the manuscript's impact and relevance. Ensure that the abstract and conclusion align closely with the main findings and contributions.</p>	

### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<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:**

Name:	<b>Mehroz Latif</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Bahauddin Zakariya University, Pakistan</b>