

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.	The manuscript contains a piece of work and all aspects of the manuscript are complete. A combination of molecular (conventional, multiplex and real-time PCR), culture and direct (Ziehl-Neelsen staining) techniques increases the accuracy of detection of Mycobacterium avium paratuberculosis, M. bovis and M. smegmatis in faecal samples of dairy animals. Therefore, this study is critical for rapid differential detection of these organisms to aid in accurate diagnosis at the earliest for effective prevention.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title could be more concise and clearer – “Differential diagnosis of Mycobacterium avium paratuberculosis, M. bovis and M. smegmatis in faecal samples of dairy animals using molecular (in-house designed multiplex PCR, IS900 PCR and TaqMan real-time PCR), Ziehl-Neelsen staining, and culture methods”.	
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.	The abstract of the manuscript is comprehensive.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The study design is straightforward and the manuscript is overall well written. The content of the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are not recent. Whilst the introduction provides background, identifies the need for the study, and summarizes relevant research, the literature review is insufficient. Elaborate.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, but typos and grammatical mistakes are found. Abbreviations are not synchronized and consistent throughout the text. Please check. The authors may get some English proofreading before the submission.	
Optional/General comments	The presentation of the conclusion would benefit from improvements.	

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:	Sangeeta Das
Department, University & Country	Assam Agricultural University, India