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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	1. It is not a longitudinal study. Usually longitudinal study involves repeated observations of the same variable over long periods of time, often many decades. I would recommend to use the term prospective study.	Change effected
	2. It is not mentioned in the material and methods that whether positive animals in dry season were included or excluded for computing the disease incidence in rainy season.	All dairy cattle within 60 days of postpartum were included for both seasons in computing the overall prevalence
	3. In abstract the authors has concluded that, "Management of endometritis in the region should address critical nutritional deficiencies through improved extension service delivery…" but the authors have not studied the impact of nutritional factors or extension services.	That was an error that we has been corrected.
	4. The material and methods section needs major revisions.	Critical changes have been made to this section
	a. The methods for diagnosing CE or SCE should be described in detail like rectal findings, vaginal speculum examination findings and vaginal/uterine fluid cytological findings. What were the predominant cell types on cytological examination-neutrophils or lymphocyte? Further the risk factors/parameters should be first enlisted inn material and methods section.	Major changes have been made based on your recommendation
	b. Although I am not an expert in statistics, the authors should mention which statistical analysis they have used. Was it logistic regression or chi square test etc.	Changes have been effected
	c. Please define what DDR is and how it was calculated. Is it odds ratio?	error noted and corrected,

	5. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION a. AS per table 1 the number of animals affected with CE and SCE is 5 and 26, respectively and number of negative animals is 109. So these figures should be same for every parameter in table 2. The figures are same for season and breed parameter only. eg under BCS parameter the number of CE and SCE affected animals is shown as 8 and 37, respectively in table 2. Table 2 needs to major revision.	Major modifications have been made based on your recommendation, thanks for the observation
	b. The written results and data in table 2 do not match e.g line 62 states that prevalence of SCE was higher in the dry season than in the rainy season but table 2 shows higher incidence in rainy season.	Corrected
	Line 62-64 reads as The majority of the dairy cattle affected were shown to be associated with a BCS as well as parity of more than 3 as shown in **Table 2**. But the data in table shows higher incidence in BCS >3 and parity of 3.	Corrected
	Line 73- 74 reads as , 'ovarian disease was shown to be the major postpartum complication on the dairy farms (20.8%, P<0.01). Delayed return to heat was shown to be between 90 – 180 days (P= 0.003). But as per data in table 2, the major complication was reproductive diseases (22.2%) and delayed return to heat is shown to be higher in above 180 days in table.	Corrected
	Line 84 reads both CE and SCE was shown to be constant during both the dry and rainy seasons but Table 2 shows higher prevalence in rainy seasons and previously (under line 62), you have mentioned that prevalence was higher in dry season.	Corrected
	Line 91 reads ovarian disease and delayed return to heat above 90 days were identified as the major predisposition factor to SCE and CE in this study. In my opinion and as per the published literature it is other way round that endometritis results in delayed heat not	Corrected

	the vice versa. **Line 94-95 reads** Those that had calved down fewer times were associated with a poorer body condition score (BCS < 3) and higher SCE burden contrary to what had been illustrated in a previous study. But the data in table 2 shows higher prevalence in parity 3. **Line 101-102 reads** The abnormally lengthened calving intervals due to endometritis have been shown to be associated with low productivity. But previously under line 91 you favored the opinion that delayed return to heat above 90 days were identified as the major predisposition factor to SCE and CE in this study. 6. **CONCLUSION** **Line 113-114 reads** The major risk factor associated with the high SCE burden was increasing parity accompanied by increasing BCS. But as per the data in table 2 there was not a definite pattern of diseases prevalence with regard to parity and BCS. Table 2 shows that prevalence of both CE and SCE increased upto 3 calvers only and then decreased. For BCS prevalence decreased from BCS of <3 to BCS of 3 and then increased	Corrected Corrected Corrected

SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	1. In keywords: Food security in Uganda does not seem to be related to this study. So may be replaced. 2. The name of breeds studied should be mentioned in material and methods section. 3. It is necessary to repeat the objective of study in material and methods section. 4. The type of ovarian diseases and reproductive diseases mentioned in table should be enlist in material and methods.	Corrected Corrected Change effected Change effected
Optional/General comments	The queries raised should be taken as a constructive criticism.	Thank you for your invaluable contribution.