



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJAAR_63233 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | STRENGTHENING THE MONITORING AND SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM FOR BOVINE TUBERCULOSIS IN POST MORTEM MATERIAL FROM SLAUGHTERED CATTLE IN ESWATINI. |
| Type of the Article | |

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/editorial-policy>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

| | 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) |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| Compulsory REVISION comments | <p>General observation The manuscript examines the validity of test results produced by a method of bovine tuberculosis diagnosis referred to as Ziehl-Neelsen direct smear microscopy using available records and literature review.</p> <p>Below are some comments to the authors to improve the paper.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. While the quality of writing is appropriate for publication, authors should screen the manuscript for typographical and grammatical errors. 2. Abstract, body and references in the manuscript should be written following appropriate AJAAR style. 3. Authors should define all acronyms or abbreviations at first mention, whether in abstract or body of manuscript. After the first mention, the acronym / abbreviation should be consistently applied afterwards. Some of them are; <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Z-N smear ii. <i>M. bovis</i> iii. FVO-DG (SANCO) <p>Abstract</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. "The results of the study revealed <i>that (i) the limitations of using the Z-N direct smear microscopy as a screening and confirmatory laboratory test for bovine tuberculosis suspected cattle carcasses</i>" This statement from the results section of the abstract is not clear. It should be restructured for clarity. 5. "the Z-N stain method <i>was not sensitive enough to identify and differentiate other acid fast bacilli co-existing in a Mycobacteria bovis infection in cattle</i>". This statement is from the results section of the abstract. There are no evidences from the results of this study to justify this claim. <p>Results section</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. "The graphic outline of the current trend in the diagnosis of bovine carcass post mortem materials from slaughter cattle was illustrated by Figure 2". The statement above is from the Results section. We are in year 2020. I don't think what the graph shows is current trend. The statement should be restructured. 7. Heading for Table 3 should be restructured. 8. Authors should not only present tables and graphs in the results section. These tables and graphs should be described in-text and brought to light. 9. The methodology indicated that both secondary data and literature review were used as sources of data/information. The results section did not | |



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | | |
|----------------------------------|--|--|
| | <p>include any results from literature review.</p> <p>10. The discussion section did not analyse the results sufficiently. Authors need to discuss the implications of the results extensively.</p> <p>11. Recommendations should be structured based on the conclusion of the study and do not require references.</p> <p>12. Overall, the authors should highlight lucidly the contribution(s) of the manuscript to the body of knowledge.</p> | |
| Minor REVISION comments | | |
| Optional/General comments | | |

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: | Olusola Olabisi Ogunseye |
| Department, University & Country | University Of Ibadan, Nigeria |