



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BMRJ_22358
Title of the Manuscript:	A STUDY OF HAEMOPARASITES OF SMALL RUMINANTS IN KARU LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA ABBATOIRS, NASARAWA STATE, NIGERIA.
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://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



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	In Introduction: Lines 80-83: It is said the objectives, but they are not clear. In one moment in the abstract it was spoken about the determination of the prevalence and the infections of haemoparasites. In the introduction it was spoken about explaining to the small farmers about the haemoparasites and its control measures. I suggest to adapt the objectives and rewrite them. In Materials and Methods Lines 135-140: In the analysis of the results, the authors refers to tests utilized in statistics analysis, however they associate the tests with identification and tick species, but in any moment of the methodology they talk about how ticks were collected and how was their identification. At this point, it should be done a big adjust to the material and methods associated to a data analysis, once they are quite disparate and unrelated. Lines 158-160: Every paragraph should be removed, including 3.1 that was referenced in the same. The results can be included in the third paragraph (lines 150-152). Lines 167-169: In the data of the globular volume it can be observed that there was no statistic difference. This way, it should be corrected when it says that the values were statistically in the normal average. The paragraph should be rewrite	Noted and corrected Ticks were not collected for this study. The ticks are the vectors that harbour these haemo-parasites. Whole blood samples collected from small ruminants were used for this study and were examined parasitologically for presence of the parasites (not ticks) and their effect on the packed cell volume of the said ruminants. Noted and Corrected. There was statistical difference in the PCV ($P < 0.05$, $P = 0.01$)



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	In Abstract: Objectives: what would be the associated factors? It is interesting to let the objectives very clear. The objectives that were written are different from the objectives that were proposed in the introduction.	Noted and Corrected
	In Introduction: Although the study is about the epidemiology of haemoparasites in small ruminants, it is missing in the introduction more development about the transmission of this diseases once it is approached the transmission to humans via proteins (in the case of meat). I suggest to explicit the way that this will affect in human consume, that in tis case was reported in the discussion that would be related to the use of chemoprophylaxis with residual power in the meat of these animals.	Noted and corrected
	In Materials and Methods: Line 104: To calculate of the sample size it was used a prevalence rate reported in previous studies of 21.7%. The study utilized to obtain the data was Pam et al. (2013), reference 8, but it could be observed that this paper describe haemoparasites in cattle, not in small ruminants. Thus this value could not be utilized in the calculation. The correct, since there is no prevalence known for small ruminants in the region of this study, it would be to utilized a prevalence of 50%. In any way, the amount of samples that were collected does not invalidates this study, but should be corrected to the sample size. Ethical Issues: Although it does not exist ethical issues in this manuscript, it is important to remind that the authors did not present the results of the evaluation of the ethics committee in animal experimentation authorizing the development of this experiment. In	Noted and corrected Ethical approval was not used for this study as the pilot study conducted before the main research revealed that it was not needed



SDI Review Form 1.6

	the case of the authors do have approval, please place the number of the protocol of the ethics committee in the end of the Methodology.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	In Introduction: Line 52. The term e.t.c. must be replaced or excluded. The present study is relevant in regional and national level in the proposed area because there is not a lot of published data until today on haemoparasites in small ruminants. However, the writing content and the expressions of the results need to be improved. There is a huge contradiction and divergency between the proposed objectives, methodology and results, and this need to be promptly reviewed.	Noted and corrected