

### Review Form 3

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">Annual Research &amp; Review in Biology</a>                                      |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_ARRB_130439   |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Variation in the rate of infection of cattle by Trypanosoma Sp in the sub-humid zone of Mali |
| Type of the Article      |  |

#### 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. | Trypanosomiasis in cattle is the concern tropical disease for Africa and other similar regions. Research on this disease is very much beneficial for scientific community but data collection of this paper is quite old (2011) and many published researches has been done since then. Write up is not much in the sequential order as author/s are out of their actual research while writing background in introduction section, research gaps and rationale are not much discussed, lengthy study area section which is not correlated with the actual study. And many more serious correction has to be made through out the paper. |   |
| Is the title of the article suitable?<br>(If not please suggest an alternative title)  | Factors associated with the Trypanosomiasis in cattle in the sub-humid zone of Mali.   |   |
| 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.      | Too much background information and less focus on research questions, methodologies, major result and discussion with final conclusion.  |   |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.  | Author/s claims that data were collected using stratified random sampling but the evidence shows it was convenient sampling. Blur study area map. WOO diagnostic technique is mentioned in abstract but no explained in methodology.   |   |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.                              | Some are old but majority are new. The concern is older data of the present paper.   |   |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?  | Need to work on some sections.   |   |
| <b>Optional/General</b> comments   | <b>Paper need to be seriously restructured omitting the unnecessary content and must focus on objectives and research questions.</b>   |   |

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |   |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name:                            | <b>Sanjay Paudel</b>  |
| Department, University & Country | <b>Institute of Agriculture and Animal Science, Tribhuvan University, Nepal</b> |