



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BMRJ_27451
Title of the Manuscript:	Sero prevalence of Equine Infectious Anemia (EIA) Virus in Sudan
Type of the Article	Original research paper

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	Title: Appropriate but does not completely reflect the main purpose of the study, so I suggest you consider "Sero prevalence of Equine Infectious Anemia (EIA) Virus in selected regions in Sudan" Abstract: Recast the second sentence as follow: " In this study, the prevalence of EIA virus antibodies was investigated in 368 sera samples collected randomly from apparently healthy horses and donkeys during 2008-2013 using indirect ELISA." While the fourth sentence "An Indirect ELISA (ID Vet Company, France) was used for detection of P26 (GAG gene) antibodies directed against the EIA virus in horses and donkeys sera" should be removed. These statements "The highest prevalence 11.1% was detected in donkey's samples collected from Halfa. Antibodies were not detected in all samples collected from Atbara." should be recasted as follows: "Across the regions sampled, the highest prevalence (11.1%) was detected in donkeys sampled from Halfa. However all the sampled donkeys from Atbara were sero-negative to EIA virus." You need to state here the conclusion of your work. Introduction: The first two sentences of the second paragraph require references. This statement "Prior to the development of a reliable ager gel immunodiffusion (AGID) test also known as	Done Done Done Done Done Done Done Done



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Coggins test, sero-diagnosis of EIA was a scientific dilemma" should be removed. It is not important here since your work is not on screening methods for EIA virus, and also this coggin test has been in use for many years now. Instead you can state the significance of the common screening tests particularly the test you used for your study.	Done
	The statement "in Sudan, only one study was conducted in Khartoum state [14]; there is no enough information about the disease situation in Sudan. The objective of this study was designed to investigate the presence of EIA virus in blood serum of horses and donkeys in different regions in Sudan using ELISA." Should be recasted as follows: " However, there is no enough information about the disease situation in Sudan. The only study conducted in Khartoum state of Sudan[14] cannot be considered as a true reflection of the disease in Sudan. It is important to know the situation in other regions of the country. We therefore aim to investigate the presence of antibodies against EIA virus in horses and donkeys from different regions in Sudan."	Done
	Materials and methods: under sample the "blood serum samples" should read "blood samples"	Done
	The title of Table 1 does not give the true content of the table. I suggest you consider: "The regional distribution of sampled horses and donkeys in Sudan between 2008 and 2013." And the heading of the table should be rearrange as follow:	Done
	Region No of horses No of donkeys Total (equid) sampled	Done
	Results: "total serum samples" should read "total sera samples"	done
		There are several types of chi square tests depending on the way the data was collected and the hypothesis being tested. 2x2 contingency table is one of them, in this study we thought of it as a test of independence Fig 1, 2 were removed
		done
		DONE



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Correct the second and third sentence with my suggestion in the abstract. Am not sure if chi-square is the right statistical tool for this kind of data, you have positive samples from different regions (about 7) and chi-square only work for 2x2 contingency table. The contents of Table 2 & 3 is the same with that of fig 1 & 2, so I suggest you go with the tables and remove the figures for better interpretation of the results. Recast the title of table 2 as " The prevalence of EIA in different regions in Sudan" and in the heading the "positivity %" should read "% prevalence". Also under the Atbra column, the " all sample -ve" should read 0 and 0% respectively. Table 3 title should read " The prevalence of EIA in horses and donkeys as per different regions in Sudan" and the heading should be rearrange as follow: <table> <tr> <th>Region</th><th>Horses</th><th>Donkeys</th></tr> <tr> <td></td><td>+ve -ve</td><td>%prevalence +ve -ve</td></tr> <tr> <td></td><td>%prevalence</td><td></td></tr> </table> Total then come after the list of regions. Discussions: The first two paragraphs should be removed. This is more of background which has already been done in your introduction. Your results are not well discussed. First you need to discuss your findings and give reasons for the variation when compare with other authors you reported, particularly that of Ibrahim from Sudan to justify your work. Secondly, you sampled two species of equid (horses and donkeys) but your discussion centered only on the donkeys nothing is said about the situation of the disease in the horses. It is also important to state	Region	Horses	Donkeys		+ve -ve	%prevalence +ve -ve		%prevalence		Done 2 paragraphs were removed Done Horse result was added Done The statement was deleted The conclusion was added Done Done
Region	Horses	Donkeys									
	+ve -ve	%prevalence +ve -ve									
	%prevalence										



SDI Review Form 1.6

	the species of equid studied by other authors you reported as it will help in your discussion. Only the author first name should be used under the statement "This result is higher than that obtained by Ibrahim Gehan[14]..." This statement "The commercial ELISA (ID Vet Company, France) used in current study detects the antibodies against EIA virus p26 (GAG gene) gene in affected equine sera." as nothing to do under the discussion, I suggest you move it to materials and method if must. What is the conclusion of your study? Because what you have here is more of recommendation. References: the reference [11] cited is nowhere to be found in the write up.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		