



Name:	UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_3168
Title of the Manuscript:	INCIDENCE OF HEPATIZOON CANIS IN A DOG FROM BAREILLY DISTRICT OF UTTAR PRADESH
Type of the Article	Short communication

General guideline:

This journal believes that no manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of 'lack of Novelty', provided the manuscript is sufficiently robust and technically sound. Too often a journal's decision to publish a paper is dominated by what the Editor/reviewer think is interesting and will gain greater readership - both of which are subjective judgments and lead to decisions which are frustrating and delay the publication. This journal will rigorously peer-review your submissions and publish all papers that are judged to be technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<http://mbimph.com/index.php/UPJOZ/editorial-policy>



1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's feedback
<p><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</p> <p>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</p> <p>(If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes</p> <p>In my opinion, this communication is of significant value to the scientific community, particularly in the context of routine health assessments among pets and domestic animals. The paper addresses a crucial gap in current practices by shedding light on the importance of systematic and official check-ups for disease occurrences in various regions. This initiative not only contributes to the overall understanding of diseases affecting animals but also serves as a vital document for raising awareness among pet owners and the scientific community. Moreover, the insights provided in this communication can be instrumental in guiding and inspiring other researchers interested in similar topics. By emphasizing the importance of regular health monitoring, the paper lays the foundation for collaborative efforts towards the well-being of our animal companions.</p> <p>2. Yes</p> <p>I would like to suggest a minor enhancement to the title. Including the time of the incident, alongside the current content. This addition has the potential to facilitate regulatory agencies and statistics providers in accessing information more efficiently. Moreover, it may contribute to expanding the audience for this work.</p> <p>I believe that incorporating the temporal dimension into the title could enhance the manuscript's relevance and impact.</p> <p>3. Yes</p> <p>4. Yes</p> <p>5. Yes</p> <p>6. Yes</p>	



--	--	--

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>	<p>In the text, authors have mentioned “the conventional diagnosis of a dog infected with H. canis” without providing details on the methods used or any corresponding references. As this information is crucial for the scientific rigor of the study, I kindly suggest you consider elaborating on the conventional diagnostic methods employed and, if possible, citing relevant references.</p> <p>Including these details will not only enhance the transparency and reliability of your study but also provide readers and fellow researchers with a comprehensive understanding of your work.</p> <p>References to studies from 2017, 2011, 2019, and 2018 in discussion is insightful on the topic. However, to enrich the depth of the discussion, I recommend considering the inclusion of more recent studies or additional references, if available. This could provide a more comprehensive understanding for readers. If, however, such data is not readily accessible, acknowledging this limitation in your discussion would be prudent. Clearly stating the need for more regular examinations and inspections in the absence of extensive data could underscore the significance of your research.</p> <p>Additionally, I propose the exploration of incorporating a figure or statistical analysis to enhance the visual impact of your findings.</p> <p>The authors’ exploration of the potential impact of climate change on tick prevalence is intriguing.</p> <p>To strengthen this argument, I suggest considering the inclusion of citations or more data that supports this perspective. Specifically, mentioning regions that historically did not experience a high occurrence of this infection but have observed changes due to</p>	<p>Conventional diagnosis protocol has been discussed elaborately with sufficient reference. Recent ref included for successful management of H canis infection in dogs and discussed. A detailed treatment protocol has been discussed with adequate ref cited. Article title has been changed as per reviewer comment.</p>
---------------------------------------	--	--



	recent climate shifts could provide valuable context. Such additions would not only bolster your argument but also contribute to the broader understanding of the correlation between climate change and the prevalence of ticks.	
Optional comments		

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>	