



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_51036
Title of the Manuscript:	OCCURRENCE OF BLUETONGUE VIRUS ANTIBODIES IN CATTLE AND SHEEP IN OGUN AND OSUN STATES, NIGERIA
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	<p>Abstract:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Change "occurrence" with "presence". - Report the study period in the abstract. - Delete the word "competitive". - Delete the word "rates" as well as throughout the manuscript. - The conclusion that "These findings suggest that bluetongue is widespread in Nigeria" is not supported by this study. The study was only conducted in two states. Please, re-edit it. - Line 34, the disease or the virus? - Line 93-95, the authors can provide more information on the performance of the ELISA for BTV antibody detection. To say "has proven to be the nest serologic test" is not necessary to support its use. - Line 106, I don't understand with "to study its effect on sex, breed, and age of the animals". What do you mean with "effect"? - Line 104: Why this study was conducted? Because BTV is a re-emerging virus? The authors have to provide a more robust explain to indicate the need for this study. Recall that the aim of the study was to determine the prevalence of BTV. - Line 110: re-edit "The design of.....study". - Line 111: please provide more information of the sample size methodology. - Line 112: why the study was conducted in Ogun and Osum states? - Line 111: change the word "experiment" with "study". - Line 111: it seems that the purpose of the study was to compare the prevalence of BTV in two states, if so, the sample size calculation was based on this comparison. Also, provide any rationale why the authors wanted to compare prevalences. - Line 115, it would be informative for readers to have a map showing the five study sites. - The study period of this investigation should be reported. Also, the way of how the study was done in the field needs to be presented. Readers want to learn how the authors have conducted the field work so that they can repeat the same approach in further studies. - The authors have to provide information on the parameters used to calculate the sample size calculation so that readers can see that the number of samples collected (340) was the required. - Line 143, what laboratory? please include name and location of the laboratory. - Line 149, where was conducted the POURQUIER® BTV cELISA kit? - Line 160, report the p-value to support that there was a significant difference. - The authors have presented several tables and these analyses should be properly reported and presented in section 2.5 Statistical Analysis. <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide explanations about why the study results in terms of prevalence were higher compared with those reported by Taylor, Obi, and Oluwayelu. - Line 216, what preventive measures? Please mention the best ones that are recommended for BTV. - Line 229: Is there any country from West African that the prevalence of BTV is high. Such information will help the suggestion given. - Line 231: is there any bluetongue disease monitoring and surveillance programme in Africa or around Nigeria? If so, please mention it. - Line 288, change the word "demonstrated" with "reported". - Line 289, the authors have no data to support that BTV infection is widespread in Nigeria. The study was only done in 5 sites from two states - Please specify the main limitations of the study. 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	- Who approved the study?	
Minor REVISION comments	None.	
Optional/General comments	None.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Christian Bautista
Department, University & Country	USA