

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Animal and Veterinary Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAVS_75221
Title of the Manuscript:	PREVALENCE AND ECONOMIC IMPACTS OF EIGHT (8) REASONS FOR SEIZURE OF SMALL RUMINANT MEAT AT THE PORT-BOUËT SLAUGHTERHOUSE OF THE AUTONOMOUS DISTRICT OF ABIDJAN, CÔTE D'IVOIRE
Type of the Article	Original Research 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://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

[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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<p>This paper describes the main causes of animal's rejection in a slaughterhouse from Côte d'Ivoire. This is a very simple, small manuscript. In my opinion, the complexity of the manuscript should be increased and macroscopic images of the main causes of condemnation should be insert in the manuscript. There are points that need to be addressed to improve the comprehensibility of this manuscript.</p> <p>INTRODUCTION SECTION This manuscript is based on the origin of the animals received in the Port-Bouët slaughterhouse and the main rejection causes. Introduction should also emphasis the importance of ante and postmortem exam to a correct sanitary evaluation of the meat, and its importance in a "one health" concept.</p> <p>RESULTS SECTION Slaughter of small ruminants in the slaughterhouse: The slaughterhouse received 235,631 small ruminants. In Europe, whenever an animal enters the slaughterhouse, it should not leave it alive. But apparently in Côte d'Ivoire most animals are not slaughtered in the slaughterhouse...Authors should clarify this issue and explain why there are so many non-slaughtered animals; this argumentation should be based on the Côte d'Ivoire national legislation. Authors also are advised to explain, in the manuscript- introduction or discussion sections- what happens to these animals... if they go to human consumption with no evaluation by the slaughterhouse techniques, authors should mention, in discussion section, the risks to human and animal health associated with these procedures, and to the risk of zoonotic spill-over</p> <p>Prevalence of reasons and bodies seized: All the percentages of the 8 main causes of rejection should be insert in result section, not just cysticercosis and hemosiderosis; in fact, this information is just present in the abstract section.</p> <p>As there is no total carcass condemnation, this information should be insert in this point, not just be present in the next point (3.1.4, line 4). Some images of affected organs condemned should be insert in the manuscript. The main causes of specific organs condemnation should also be mentioned in the manuscript, individually, in text or in a table (example: liver (cirrhosis (n,%), distomatosis (n,%), abscesses(n,%), hemochromatosis (n,%), tuberculosis(n,%),...); lung (tuberculosis(n,%), abscesses(n,%), congestion(n,%)), and so on).</p> <p>DISCUSSION SECTION As meat can constitute a danger for the consuming population, in this section, the importance of national food safety policies, animals/meat inspection policies and procedures, and/or food legislation (Codex Alimentarius), should be discussed; the risk of non- slaughtered animals to the spread of zoonosis should also be addresses on a "one-health" perspective.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments

ABSTRACT SECTION

Aims- line 1: Please replace “*This study was initiated to contribute...*” to “*This study intends to contribute*”

Results, line 3-6: Please replace “The proportion of animals slaughtered at the slaughterhouse is 31% and the prevalences of the reasons for seizure are cysticercosis (0.35%), 3.32% (echinococcosis), 5.07% (cirrhosis), 5.46% (tuberculosis), 9.43% (abscesses), 13.25% (congestion), 28.97% (distomatosis), and 34.15% (hemosiderosis).” to “The proportion of animals slaughtered at the slaughterhouse is 31% and the prevalence of the causes for carcass condemnation are hemosiderosis (34.15%), distomatosis (28.97%), congestion (13.25%), abscesses (9.43%), tuberculosis (5.46%), hepatic cirrhosis (5.07%), echinococcosis (3.32%), and cysticercosis (0.35%).
Please mention if the condemnation was total or partial.

Results, line 3-6: This sentence is duplicated. Please remove it from the manuscript.

MATERIAL AND METHODS SECTION

2.1.2. Biological material: Authors should mention in the manuscript the main breed observed in the slaughterhouse; this information should not just be present in figure legends. In fact, all these images of the breeds analyzed (figures 1 and 2) are not important to the manuscript.

RESULTS SECTION

3.1.1. Supply of the slaughterhouse, line 1: The sentence “Figure 3 shows the supply of small ruminants to the slaughterhouse by country.” should be transferred to the end of the of the second sentence. So, text should mention: “The slaughterhouse received 235,631 small ruminants... and Niger respectively. Figure 3 shows the supply of small ruminants to the slaughterhouse by country.”

3.1.4. Economic aspects related to the different organs seized, line 1: The sentence “Table 1 provides an estimate of the economic losses due to partial seizures.” should be insert after the information of the economic loses.

3.1.4. Economic aspects related to the different organs seized, line 4: Regarding the sentence “No total seizures were observed as a result of the inspections”, this information should be present previously, for example in point 3.1.3.

DISCUSSION SECTION

Page 9, line 10 – Please replace “The observation of Côte d'Ivoire peak...” to “The observation of Côte d'Ivoire peak...”

As meat can constitute a danger for the consuming population, in this section, the importance of national food safety policies, animals/meat inspection policies and procedures, and/or food legislation (Codex Alimentarius), should be discussed; the risk of non- slaughtered animals to the spread of zoonosis should also be addresses on a “one-health” perspective.

REFERENCES

Please standardize journal titles: all abbreviated or all in full.

Reference 8: There is an error in one author and the name of the journal is missing. So, please replace “Bacishoga ZS., Mituga NV., Heri CT., Lutwamuzire CD., Kafirongo MJ., Sanvura M., Vincent P. The causes of meat seizures at the public slaughterhouse of Beni / North Kivu province in DR Congo. 2015 : 89- 99.” to “Bacishoga

Review Form 1.6

	<p>ZS., Mituga NV., Heri CT., Lutwamuzire CD., Kafirongo MJ., Sanvura MVP. The causes of meat seizures at the public slaughterhouse of Beni / North Kivu province in DR Congo. International Journal of Innovation and Scientific Research 2015: 89-99.”</p> <p>Reference 10: Please replace “...practical manual” to Practical Manual”.</p> <p>Reference 13: Please replace “Review Elev. Med. vet. Country too” to “Revue d’Élevage et de Médecine Vétérinaire des Pays Tropicaux” or to “Revue Elev. Méd. Vét. Pays Trop”, according to authors use journals abbreviated or in full.</p>	
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:	Fernanda Seixas
Department, University & Country	Trás-os-Montes e Alto Douro University, Portugal