

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_130437
Title of the Manuscript:	Using in-house designed multiplex PCR for differential detection of Mycobacterium avium paratuberculosis, M. bovis and M. smegmatis from faecal samples of dairy animals in parallel to Ziehl-Neelsen staining, faecal culture, IS900 PCR and TaqMan real-time PCR
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>
Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Yes	<div>1. This study is important for rapid differential detection of mycobacterial infections involving M. bovis, MAP and M. smegmatis (NTM) from faecal samples of cattle and buffaloes.</div> <div>2. The inhouse multiplex PCR may be used alongside the Intradermal Tuberculin and Johnin tests for screening of TB, JD and M. smegmatis infections in farm animals.</div> <div>3. It may be important in screening as well as confirmatory diagnosis of mycobacterial infections like TB, JD and M. smegmatis and help in the elimination program of these diseases from the farm animals.</div>
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	No changes made
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes	No changes made except Grammatical correction (highlighted)
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes	Added some references and made grammatical corrections (highlighted)
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	<div>Following New References has been added in the discussion section:</div> <div>Mohan & Kushwaha, 2024; Soumya <i>et al.</i>, 2009; Haghkhah & Maleki, 2009; Tripathi <i>et al.</i>, 2009; Espejo & Wells, 2009; Leite & Stabel, 2012.</div>
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	Grammatical correction has been made in the manuscript (highlighted)
Optional/General comments	Some grammatically mistakes found. Correct it.	Made grammatical corrections (highlighted) of the whole manuscript and added some references in the discussion section.

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?	<div><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></div>	The study has been approved by the Institutional Ethical Committee. No ethical issue was involved in this study, as no animals were harmed during the study. All the sample collection from farm animals, laboratory research work including culture work were done following standard procedures/guidelines according to WOAH Manual.