



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	Line 1: I have a technical objection to your title. This is not a prevalence, but a frequency study. In a prevalence, researcher know the exposed population within a particular area. In turn, a frequency study disregards the existence of a population. The latter is the case here, since you must likely ignored the animals' provenance. Consequently, I kindly suggest changing your title replacing "seroprevalence" by "frequency". Line 13: Please include a Conclusion related to your Objectives Lines 27-29: What is the purpose of using four different techniques? Please justify. Line 31: Provide some background information related to the location of the study, e.g. climate, area size, goat population, animal management practices, milk and meat production, and other details. Line 74: A brief description of your statistical analysis is lacking. Also, you should describe here how true and false positive samples were determined and how sensitivity and specificity were calculated. Line 98: How did you determined true and false positive samples? You did not mention the use of any gold standard test for comparison purposes. Please specify. Lines 109-110: How did you determined sensitivity and specificity? A gold standard test is required as reference for that purpose. Line 204: Why are you using C –ELISA as a reference? According to OIE, MAT provides better results, at least in bovines.	Needful has been done in revised manuscript. Needful has been done in revised manuscript. Needful has been done in revised manuscript. Needful has been done in revised manuscript. Needful has been done in revised manuscript. Samples positive by ELISA were considered true positive whereas those negative by ELISA but positive by other tests were considered false positive. Formulas are given in revised manuscript. ELISA was considered as gold test in the study MAT detects antibody to particulate antigens whereas ELISA detects Ab to soluble Ags.
Minor REVISION comments	Lines 33-34: Please provide some background on the slaughterhouses, i.e.: number, number of animals sacrificed at each one, season or month during which samples were taken. And so forth. Lines 105-106: The low or high numbers of positive or negative samples	Needful has been done in revised manuscript



SDI Review Form 1.6

	detected by each test is not an indication of reliability. Please check. Line 144: Please follow journal guidelines regarding references format. Line 190: Table 1 is not very illustrative. Try to summarize your results into categories. Line 199: You can modify Table 2 creating a cross-table to indicate the amount of animals showing the combination of titles. Line 200: You claim that "Difference between the two means is not significant" but you did not mention any Statistical test nor provide any associated significance. Line 204: The per cent symbol should be included next to each category decriptor, not inside the grill.	Needful has been done in revised manuscript Needful has been done in revised manuscript It is described in the text. The present display is simpler. Needful has been done in revised manuscript Needful has been done in revised manuscript
Optional/General comments	The paper seems appropriate to the intended journal. The Abstract, the Introduction, and References are OK but the Methodology could be enlarged to provide background information on the study site explain statistical analysis and how other measurements were calculated. For technical reasons, t is recommended to replace the use of seroprevalence" for "frequency" throughout the entire document. My impression is that this article does not contains enough robust data to evidence the statement made on page 5, lines 98-112. I suggest verifying what scientific literature has to say on this regard. For all the previous reasons, it is recommended to publish this paper after all corrections have been made.	Needful has been done in revised manuscript Needful has been done in revised manuscript