



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_33367
Title of the Manuscript:	Quantitation of TLR-2 mRNA Expression in Bovine Mastitis caused by E. Coli
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	The manuscript has a good scientific finding, thus proposing a marker for detection of subclinical mastitis diagnose though TLR2 gene expression, but some aspects need to be clarified, as follow: Overall, the manuscript needs English grammar revision and some aspects are confusing, please see pdf. Introduction is lacking reference in some statements. Methodology: Authors should state with methodology was used to obtain milk sample and bacterial analysis to rule out the possibility of other microorganism that could be causing infection, e.g. concomitant streak in sheep blood agar to exclude the presence of <i>S.aureus</i> of <i>S. agalctiae</i> as per National Mastitis Council. Also Authors need to state which method were used to standardize SCC amount before RNA extraction, otherwise variation in SCC amount could influence TLR2 gene expression e.g. higher SCC could induce a false increase in gene expression. Californi mastitis test and SCC are not the main test used to detect clinical mastitis, it is detected though Tamis test and physical examination. Results and Discussion: Lines 69 to 78 are more fit to the introduction than to discussion and should be moved or removed,	We would like to thank the reviewer for careful and thorough reading of this manuscript and for the thoughtful comments and constructive suggestions, which help to improve the quality of this manuscript. English grammer has been improved in the revised version of manuscript. New references are included in the revised version of manuscript. Reference is added for methodology used for bacterial analysis in the revised version of manuscript. Standardization of SCC was done by direct microscopic examination method. In our study samples were collected based on physical examination. Many studies reported the use of CMT & SCC to verify the clinical stage of mastitis, hence we also followed the same test. Per your suggestion, line 69 to 78 are removed from discussion.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		