



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_46311
Title of the Manuscript:	Molecular detection of Coxiella burnetii in stray dogs in Klang Valley, Malaysia
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>)

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What was the basis of sampling dogs from different sites? There is huge difference in number of dogs sampled from different sites, justify. 2. The reference- Khoo J., Lim F.S, Chen Frezshin, Phoon Wai-Hong, Khor Chee-Sieng, Pike B.L., Chang Li-Yen and AbuBakar Sazaly (2016). Coxiella Detection in ticks from wildlife and livestock in Malaysia. Vector-Borne and Zoonotic Diseases, 6:12. is neither numbered in the references section nor is cited in the text. Clear it. 	<p>1. The basis of sampling dogs from different sites is because, our research was design purposefully on stray dogs and these are the places we get them beside that, we also want to know the rate of spread of the organism in the area.</p> <p>The larger part of the samples was collected from DVKL because, it is a government body that is responsible for seizing any animals that are found roaming about freely while, the other organizations are private bodies that volunteer in looking after small stray animals and cannot accommodate more than their capability.</p> <p>2. Noted and corrected into appropriate position.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Line 17-20, rephrase. 2. Line 45, use comma instead of and. 3. Line 64, use tick instead of ticks. 4. Line 68, close with parenthesis. 5. Line 71, were is used twice, try some other word. 6. Line 105, use was instead of were. 7. Line 117, The primers (Inokuma <i>et al.</i>, 2003) (Table 1). is incomplete. 	Done
Optional/General comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

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?	<u><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></u> No	The corrections have been executed and are highlighted in yellow