



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BMRJ_25803
Title of the Manuscript:	Serological Detection of Equine herpes virus (EHV) type 1 and 4 In Sudan
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The aim of this study is clear and the method to detect equine herpes virus type 1 and 4 is good. Since there is no previous studies of the survey of EHV type 1 and 4 in Sudan, this manuscript is acceptable for publication. However, there are some places the representation need to be changed. They are given in minor revision comments.	Changes were done
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	(1) The abbreviation of OIE is not clear, which appears in the last line in the first paragraph of the introduction and in the reference [2]. If abbreviations are used in the text, they should be defined in the text where first used. (2) Subclinical should be subclinical in the 5 lines from the top of the second paragraph of the introduction. (3) Jugular should be jugular in the first line in page 3. (4) In table 1, Animal spp. and +ve are not clear. The numbers 39 and 7 are marked by asterisk. You should write the explanation for their description. The two (0.0)s in Khartoum are missing %. (5) Rapid should be rapid in the two lines from the bottom in page 4. (6) EHV-4[2] should be EHV-4[2] in the 6 lines from the top in page 5. (7) The writing style of journals in reference is not consistent. They should be consistent. The writing style of books in reference [3] and [9] are also different.	Done Done Done Changed and removed(asterisk) Done Done Done Done
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		