Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**Journal of Scientific Research and Reports**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JSRR_114734**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Unveiling Urban Canines: Leveraging Single-Sight and Sight–Resight Survey for Street Dog Population Estimation and Enhanced Rabies Surveillance in Metropolitan City of Bruhat Bengaluru Mahanagara Palike, Karnataka, India**
Type of the Article	**Original Research Article**

Review Form 1.7

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. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?** (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) **2. Is the title of the article suitable?** (If not please suggest an alternative title) **3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?** **4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** **5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?** **6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	**1.** The manuscript is important in the light of the major impact of street dog populations in many countries and the crucial role of management policies in reducing risks, particularly the spread of rabies. This topic has been the subject of numerous publications in recent decades, but the nature of each population (human and canine) requires new, targeted expertise. The rigorous methods used reinforce the work. **2.** The title is precise and clear, indicating the survey population, methods, and study area. It includes 28 words but it is not too long. **3.** The abstract clearly describes the purpose of the work, animal population and methods used, main results and conclusions, following sub-sections as requested. **4.** The structure is appropriate. Some additional subsections could be added depending on the revisions made to the discussion section. **5.** No significant scientific errors were observed. Formulas taken from the literature are used correctly. **6.** The lack of references - only 14 for a subject that has been studied regularly in recent decades - is one of the key points that needs to be reviewed, along with the discussion, which is also far too short. Many papers about this topic of street dogs contain > 50 references. I recommend that author(s) include at the very least 25 references, judged to be among the most relevant. Some of these have been suggested below: Acosta-Jamett et al. Demography of domestic dogs in rural and urban areas of the Coquimbo region of Chile and implications for disease transmission. Preventive Veterinary Medicine. 2010;94:272-281. Belo VS, Werneck GL, da Silva ES, Barbosa DS, Struchiner CJ. Population Estimation Methods for Free-Ranging Dogs: A Systematic Review. PLoS ONE. 2015;10(12):e0144830. Butler JRA, Bingham J. Demography and dog-human relationships of the dog population in Zimbabwean communal lands. The Veterinary Record. 2004;147:442-446.	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	Excellent! Apart from a few very minor elements	
Optional/General comments	All the comments made in the review are kindly expressed. The subject of the article is well adapted to the general scope of the journal. The topic of the management of street dogs draws significant attention in relation with reducing excessive proliferation, bites, and zoonoses, mostly rabies. The overall writing appears clear, concise, and allows a good understanding by novice readers or specialists of other fields.	

	The paper has some minor weaknesses, in both content and form. The main issue is the far too underdeveloped discussion, lacking further interpretations and references. Instructions for authors advise “a length of 3000-6000 words, including everything”. Since the manuscript includes around 3800 words, the discussion can easily be completed by a few paragraphs and many references. mainly impacted by the far too short discussion	

PART 2:

	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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Belhaoues Fabien**
Department, University & Country	**France**