



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2013_IJTDH_7025
Title of the Manuscript:	Trends in the epidemiology of brucellosis in a highly burdened region in Egypt: A 16 year experience (1997-2012)
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Comments on the manuscript titled: Trends in the epidemiology of brucellosis in a highly burdened region in Egypt: A 16 year experience (1997-2012) The manuscript describes epidemiology of human and partly also of animal brucellosis in a particular area in Egypt. The information contained in the manuscript may be useful to understand the epidemiology of the disease and important risk factors. However, the manuscript is poorly organized and lacks flow to enable the reader to easily understand the contents. The discussion is redundant, too long (compare 3.75 pages (abstract, Introduction, methods, result) to almost 3 pages of discussion/conclusion) and does not focus on the most important or key parts of the essence of the manuscript. The title should indicate the area clearly: instead of "highly burdened area" it should name the area. Why the area is selected for study should be described briefly in the materials/methods. Because the manuscript partly described animal brucellosis, it may be clear to the reader if the title clearly indicates that the epidemiology is on human brucellosis. Therefore, the title should be modified as:	Organization was considered and description of is the disease in human and animals was considered. The information on human and animal brucellosis are clearly separated The word burden frequently used in was substituted in some occasions by other words We would like to keep the title as it was, as study setting is clearly described in the methods section.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<u>“Trends in the epidemiology of human brucellosis in Damanhour fever hospital in Northern Egypt: A 16 year experience (1997-2012).</u> The information on human and animal brucellosis should be clearly separated either by subheading or given in separate paragraphs. In some areas it is not possible to clearly identify if a given sentence /paragraph is dealing with human or animal brucellosis. For example lines 40-45 describe about animal brucellosis; and line 46 -47 reads: “Accordingly, a substantial increase in the number of brucellosis infected patients in the recent past (1988-1998) from 24 to 1429 cases respectively has been recorded and warned occurrence of an epidemic (10)”. This does not indicate if it is dealing with animal or human brucellosis. The “infected patients” in the sentence if refers to human patients it should read “infected human patients” because the sentences before that (lines 40-45) were dealing with animal brucellosis. Similar sentences and paragraphs that are not clear are common in the manuscript. There are other several minor concerns such as: The word “burdened” is used repeatedly in the manuscript. It is more expressive if burden/burdened is replaced with other more clear words such as “infected”, “afflicted” etc., Similar misplaced/misused words/terminologies, minor grammatical and stylistic errors are common in the	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	manuscript. The author/authors should get the manuscript checked by colleagues with better command of the English language. -Use “unpasteurized” or “unboiled” or “infected” milk/milk products instead of “unheated” milk. -some variations in patient groups are ambiguous: For example “farmers” Vs “householders”.. this should be defined in materials/ methods section. Methods: Line 76 refers to “data was abstracted retrospectively...from logbook” ... but on line 82 a sentence indicates that “complete clinical evaluation was done for all enrolled cases in the study’... this is not clear. The patients whose information was analyzed retrospectively and those on whom clinical evaluation was made should be clearly separated in materials and methods (subheading or separate paragraphs). The same is true to animal and human cases which occasionally flow into one another (mixed). The manuscript is inadvertently written and should be checked for mistakes before submission. For example: -Line 76”over 10 years period (1997-2012); there are at least 15 years between1997-2012. -Line 74: range between 40000 to 9000?? Is it	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	to refer to 4000 to 9000? Result section: Please separate results of human and animal brucellosis by subheading for clear understanding and compare the results under discussion. Lines 144-150... indicates significant difference in distribution of brucellosis according to occupation... especially high in farmers together with housewives..... but line 353-355 indicate there is no definite disease risk attributable to animal contact, food consumption or occupation etc. If so, why is the case consistently higher in farmers together with housewives? Generally the manuscript is informative, but poorly organized, lacks clarity as well as sound and plausible conclusion; and needs major revision before being considered for publication.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		