



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	Mismatch of title and manuscript body. Since prevalence is a broad term and encompasses various criteria that are met only after selecting the sample size using any probability sampling technique, so that the sample is true representative of the target population. Because after interpretation of the results, the information obtained is generalised on the entire target population. Any deviation from that will result in a bias that will render the entire outcome of the study invalid. The authors obtained a seroprevalence of 5.23% after selecting a sample size of 191, this mean that 5.23% entire goat population of Ludhiana district at a given point of time is infected with brucellosis. However this is not true as the method employed in selecting the sample is non probability method and even fails to meet the criteria of central limit theory. The abstract is too short should provide information regarding methodology also and conclusion drawn Introduction is too short No statistical analysis of the data done. It seems that the authors themselves are confused about how write a manuscript, otherwise the work they have done can be presented in an excellent manner	
Minor REVISION comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments		
---	--	--

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Malik Raies</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>S. K. University of Agricultural Sciences and Technology, Kashmir, India</i>