



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

|                          |                                                                            |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Journal Name:            | <b><u>British Journal of Applied Science &amp; Technology</u></b>          |
| Manuscript Number:       | <b>2014_BJAST_12830</b>                                                    |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>A Metrological Contribution to the Diagnosis of Bovine Tuberculosis</b> |
| Type of the 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) |
|--------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments | <p>The authors describe the relevance of calibrated callipers to evaluate the CCT assay in cattle. They claim that they evaluate and discuss the use of callipers with an accuracy/precision of 0.1 and 0.01 mm (see abstract). However, all tables that show actual measurements only show results with a precision of one decimal digit (i.e., 0.1 mm), and not two (0.01 mm). Figure 2 shows the use of a calliper on a steel gauge block. It would be much more informative and interesting if there was a figure that shows an actual measurement of a skin fold of an animal. To me (but I am not a veterinarian) it is not clear how callipers with a precision of 0,1 and 0,01 mm can be efficiently used on comparatively soft and compressible animal tissue.</p> <p>Table 10: How were uncertainty values obtained for the digital calliper? On gauge block measurements?</p> <p>Furthermore, figures 1 and 3 appear to be redundant to me and should be condensed into one figure.</p> |                                                                                                                                                                               |
| <b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments      | <p>In all tables, abbreviations used should be explained in the legend</p> <p>"fold of skin" should be replaced by "skin fold" throughout the text</p> <p>Replace "sensibility" by "sensitivity" (lane 371, 379)</p> <p>Replace "repeatability" by "reproducibility" in the text (lanes 332, 347, 502)</p> <p>Replace (temperature) "distance" by "difference" (lanes 288, 301)</p> <p>Replace "UI" by "IU" (international units) (lanes 128, 129)</p> <p>Lane 300: "delta ICbpi" should read "delta UCbpi"</p> <p>Lanes 122, 127, 129, 132, 134: put quotations/references in brackets [#]</p> <p>Lane 229: explain "k" in the term U/k</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |                                                                                                                                                                               |
| <b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments    | The manuscript should be revised by a statistician for correctness of calculations and formulae used. This is outside my scope of knowledge.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |                                                                                                                                                                               |

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |                                                                                                   |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Name:                            | Walter M. R. Oelemann                                                                             |
| Department, University & Country | Department of Immunology, Institute of Microbiology, Federal university of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil |