



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_35974
Title of the Manuscript:	SEROPREVALENCE OF BRUCELLOSIS IN GOATS IN LUDHIANA DISTRICT OF PUNJAB STATE OF INDIA
Type of the 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	Abstract. In the abstract, authors did not mention why are they studying brucellosis in this region? Because brucellosis is a problem? Because no previous studies were made, etc. I cannot see the relevance of this work for the area of study. Introduction. Once again, here even we can see that authors mentioned a research of brucellosis performed in 2000 in various districts of Punjab, it is not very well understandable the importance to do it in Ludhiana District, because, is it a region where the goats are rising?, or because the population of goats is high? Because is the people exposed? Is the population making fresh cheeses with goat's milk? I cannot see the point of this work. Authors need to correlate other information that is missing, the social impact, the public health impact, the animal health impact.... why the brucellosis is important, first in India (in the country), then in the place of study. Otherwise the work is weak, I think that the work could be important for the place, but I don't see it in the work now. Material and methods. Could the authors include from which Institution are the "guidelines of Institutional Animal Ethics Committee" Here is missing information about the goats in study. For example: maybe a map of the region and the places that were sampling. how many slaughter houses were included in the work? Why did the authors decide to sample in these places? How the sampling was executed, dates of the sampling, if this sampling was over a year?, etc, etc. Discussion This section needs to be modified. There is not a real discussion about the results. Once again which is the importance of this work for the region? Real comparison with other works, more deeply. ETHICAL ISSUE: yes, authors mentioned they followed the guidelines of Institutional Animal Ethics Committee, but is missing the Institution are these guidelines from.	Needful has been done in revised form. The year 2000 report was an old report and recent data from Ludhiana was not available in the literature. The study is important because humans are exposed to raw milk and meat from infected goats posing a public health hazard. Animals are also exposed to it. Brucellosis is important because the production and reproductive losses have serious effect on livestock economy in Punjab as well as India. It was IAEC of GADVASU, Ludhiana. Five slaughter houses and meat shops in different parts of Ludhiana were chosen for sampling over a year as they represented different zones of district. Needful has been done in revised form. It was IAEC of GADVASU, Ludhiana.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		