

Updates in Public Health and Preventive Medicine

Review Report

Open Access

Article Title: Similar Prevalence of Anti-Leptospira Antibodies in Domestic Dogs from Urban and Rural Areas in Southern Chile: A Public Health Concern

Reviewer: Geraldine McLeod, University of Otago, New Zealand

Submission Date: April 05, 2017

Review Status: Revision Required

How to Cite this Report: Geraldine McLeod. Review Report for: Similar Prevalence of Anti-Leptospira Antibodies in Domestic Dogs from Urban and Rural Areas in Southern Chile: A Public Health Concern [Version 1, Awaiting Peer Review]. Updates Public Health Prev Med. (2017) 1: 3.1

Review Report

Thank you for asking me to review this manuscript. The reviewed study was a cross-sectional study conducted in 2011/2012 which examined the prevalence of anti-Leptospira antibodies in domestic dogs from urban and rural areas in southern Chile.

Overall, the study design and write up are of a good quality. However, this manuscript would benefit from editing by an English speaker. This is because, throughout the manuscript and the references, there are a number of typos and inaccuracies.

I will address each section of the manuscript in turn. I have not referred to page numbers as the manuscript did not include them.

Abstract:

- a. Please put the year data collection took place.
- b. I am unsure that anti-Leptospira antibodies reported in this study should be considered “widespread” (I will also address this issue in the Discussion).

Study area:

I was wondering why only dairy farms were selected?

Sample size estimation:

Is it 44.827 dogs or 44,827 dogs?

Updates in Public Health and Preventive Medicine

Study design and population surveyed.

Frequentist and Bayesian approximation of the prevalence:

- a. The final sentence of paragraph 1 “The possible differences...” should be amended. As it reads currently, it is boarding on inaccurate. The Chi square test should at least have the correct name (Chi square test for Independence).
- b. in paragraph 3 a brief description of what high Se and lo Se mean. That is, test sensitivity is the ability of a test to correctly identify those with the disease (true positive rate), whereas test specificity is the ability of the test to correctly identify those without the disease (true negative rate) – or something similar.

Results:

In paragraph 1 it is unnecessary to include the same information in the text and in the tables. The reader almost does not need the tables at all. Was the statistical significance testing using 2-sided tests? What was the p-value for the non-significant test?

Discussion:

In the third paragraph beginning “Some cross-sectional studies...” had

- a. Sentences that could be improved. I am not sure what you mean by “reduced extension” and b. reference [59] seems to be an orphan and the sentence does not make sense.
- c. Also in paragraph 5 beginning with “Regarding rural areas...”
 - a. the sentence “as we do not sampled” needs to be corrected.
 - b. The use of the word “widespread” needs to be justified as I don’t think a 10% prevalence would be considered widespread.

References

There are some issues with the reference section. Eg: references 25; 35 (OECD, not OCDE).

I have read this submission. I believe that I have an appropriate level of expertise to confirm that it is of an acceptable scientific standard, however I have significant reservations, as outlined above.