



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

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
New Title of the Manuscript:	FREQUENCY OF OCCURANCE OF BRUCELLOSIS IN GOATS IN LUDHIANA DISTRICT OF PUNJAB STATE OF INDIA
Type of Article:	

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
The manuscript improved but authors need to polish some parts. Abstract: Mutton and milk. Here I guess is raw milk? I'm sorry, but I'm not familiar with the term mutton, I found is meat from goat, I have a question, why mutton is a risk factor to get brucellosis? Is because people eat it raw? Could you explain this in the introduction? Is the fresh cheese not a problem in brucellosis transmission in India? Line 45-55. References are missing. Line 56. Serum samples. The year of sampling is not indicating, also how many sampling were made in the year? From where anatomical area of the animal was taken the sample? How many ml of blood were taken? Here, authors did not say how many goats did they estimated to sample based on previous brucellosis frequency information. Or how did you calculate how many samples will you get? Line 62. References are missing. Line 71-84. Reference 7, this reference mentioned a test for <i>Salmonella pullorum</i>. I don't know if it is a mistake, or if the authors modified such method using an antigen against <i>Brucella</i>? This part should be clarifying, as this MAT is not known as a test for brucellosis!! Here, could the authors mention which was the antigen used???? Why this method is using for brucellosis? Is there any reference where the results of using this method has been validated previously for brucellosis?	



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

144-157; 159-166. These parts look more like results than discussion

The discussion need still some work, to be a real discussion. Now the authors are limiting to describe results, but they are not integrating or connecting their results, discussing about the problem, their findings, the tests used, etc. This part is still weak.

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Araceli Conteras-Rodriguez</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Department of Microbiology, Instituto Politecnico Nacional, Mexico</i>