



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_27280
Title of the Manuscript:	Babesiosis in a Cattle Slaughtering Abattoir in Abeokuta, 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. Based on this study, I am sceptical about concluding endemicity of infection in the catchment area of this abattoir. I would like to think that this study shows presence of infection within the study area and not necessarily that infection is endemic. 2. Change line 29 to read: a haemoparasite 3. Results section on prevalence by sex, age & breed. Statements there better phrased as: i. There was no sex & age predilection in terms of infection by the haemoparasites ($P < 0.05$) ii. Infections by <i>Theileria</i> and <i>Trypanosoma spp.</i> showed a breed predisposition ($P > 0.05$)	1. Thank you for the comment, we have revised our text accordingly 2. We were referring to the disease and not the parasites, and as such the use of haemoparasitic disease is appropriate 3. Manuscript have been revised based on the reviewers comment
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. The differences in prevalence observed in this study and that by other authors are ascribed to possible differences in husbandry practices, veterinary care and state of immunity of the examined cattle. However, none of this information is provided in the sampling which makes it a bit difficult to ascribe these as reasons for differences. I think this needs to be clarified. Other factors such as geographical location and spread of vector could actually have played a more significant role in these differences since spread of vector-borne disease is strongly influenced by presence of competent vectors in the area.	1. Yes, we agree with the reviewer and have revised our manuscript accordingly. We have expunged the unnecessary probable causal factors.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1. Since the study looked at other haemoparasites, besides Babesia, is there any harm in changing the title of the manuscript to indicate this fact. I am of the opinion that such a change would improve the manuscript visibility and relevance. This would not involve a lot of changes in the manuscript especially considering that the discussion is based on broad haemoparasites and not specifically on babesiosis.	1. Thanks, we have revised the manuscript topic as well
---	--	---