



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_15816
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevalence of Endometritis and its associated risk factors in Dairy Cattle of Central Uganda
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>)



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Title: 1. This should be Incidence because of the type of study (longitudinal) because all cows began the study healthy and became a case during the study period. Otherwise it is a kind of prevalence of period, but you could gain more if use Incidence instead prevalence. Introduction: 1. The authors have to provide more data about the prevalence elsewhere because of the absence of data near the study region. May be data of studies carried out in (sub) tropical conditions or in similar management conditions than the herds analyzed in this study. I think studies in Asia or America can serve as point of reference. 2. Why did not include the type of parturition (dystocia, cesarean section), the retention of foetal membranes, twinning, pre-mature calving, among others. Material and Methods: 1. How many farms comprises this area? What percentage of farms where included in the study? How representative they are regarding the production systems exiting around? 2. How you calculate the sample size: what parameters they used? In a rapid exercise, for 15% of expected prevalence, with 9% confidence, 5% error and 1000 cows, the sample size is 196 (or 164 corrected). So, in	We did follow up on the cows that were found presenting with the topic of study at the time of the initial visit thus we have changed to prospective study. And we therefore would like to maintain the title There has been little or no studies about this topic within the sub-Saharan region of Africa, Major modifications have been made We hope this serves as a baseline study for further country wide research, as put in the recommendation We did not find the need to calculate sample size, we randomly selected famers and some of the ones we visited with no inclusion animals (60 days postpartum) were excluded thus the sample size we



SDI Review Form 1.6

	case of set 20% of expected prevalence or increase the number of cows, this increases significantly. This is a core issue when one are talking about prevalence or incidence (like in this study). 3. There is not an explanation about the statistical methods to assess risk factors, even to calculate the disease risk ratio. 4. You are talking about the "prevalence and risk factors in Ugandan dairy cattle"; so, one can interpret that you are studying a valid sample in size and representativeness. Here is when the previous observation (N° 2) has more importance. Results and discussion 1. I guess the data between parenthesis is the row percentage; however this is not indicated for the reader. Moreover, the sum of the percentages does not give 100% as the result. 2. There is not any indication about the result of the comparison of percentages or the risk ratios by factor. The inclusion of two more columns, one for the RR and other for the 95%CI , plus the use of symbols for indicating the differences between percentages could make this table more informative. Conclusion: 1. The first part is obvious because all diseases are multifactorial, and the second part goes beyond the scope of the study.	have. Major changes have been made based on your recommendations Error corrected, we are talking about central Uganda, and we sufficiently believe this sample size is significant given the nature of the study Major changes have been made based on your recommendations Major changes have been made based on your recommendations Major changes have been made based on your recommendations
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Results and discussion: 1. Table 1 can be dropped. This information can be expressed in continuous text in a couple of lines. 2. You should not say "severely" when only 1 from 5 cows had the event. This 20% it is not a good figure of a prevalence or incidence for the breed when only 5 cows were taken into account. Again, a simple calculation of chi-square test, or confidence intervals could be enough to explain the results. 3. Nowadays, you have to use the exact number of the P value because it gives more information. Remember that P is highly dependent of the sample size; so, like in this case, a P value below 0.1 could have some relative importance. 4. "Predisposition factor" is not the correct way to name this factor. A predisposition factor is one that is not modifiable, so it is part of the nature of the animal an impossible to change: i.e. breed, age, sex, genetic, blood type, etc. You should use risk factor. 5. Delayed return to heat: Is this a cause or an effect? Are you sure that the delayed return to heat was first than metritis?	Thanks for the observation but it is the highlight of the research and thus we feel it necessary to maintain it. Change effected Regarding P values that is noted, . Editing error. Change effected Major changes have been made
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I think this study is important because no any works have been published on this issue; however, It has many defects than must be corrected, it is a short communication.	Thank you for your invaluable comments and contribution