

# Review of: "Clinical and Subclinical Bovine Mastitis: Staphylococcus aureus Isolation and Identification from Dairy Farms Located in and Around Hawassa Town, Southern Ethiopia"

Chukwuemeka Okolo<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of Nigeria

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

A good work, not novel but quite relevant as touching the current epidemiology of mastitis in the study region. Could be published when some important corrections are made. The following are some issues to consider.

## INTRODUCTION section

1. Recast the sentence in paragraph 3, line 3, of the introduction to make it clear.
2. The fourth paragraph of the introduction (talking about milk contamination sources) is outside the focus of the work; please consider removing this.
3. Paragraph 8, line 3, of the introduction: what do you mean by during SCC? Do you mean 'during mastitis?'
4. Paragraph 9, lines 1 to 4. Please remove. Further information about *S. aureus* is not needed. Generally, a 9-paragraph introduction is a lot. Consider trimming it.
5. Paragraph 9, last 3 lines: recast the statement of your objectives for better clarity. Your objective was to determine the prevalence of clinical and subclinical mastitis in cows around the Hawassa region, and to determine the isolation rate of *S. aureus* from positive cases.

## METHOD section

6. CMT subsection: Was all the scoring performed by the same person, different single persons, more than one person, and why? Usually, consensus scoring by the same set of experts is more reliable.
7. Study design subsection: please include details of how random sampling was done to select the subjects.
8. Isolation and Identification subsection.  
The authors cultured the milk samples after 24 hrs; was this only for logistics reasons or to enhance the isolation rate? Some reports have shown that milk incubation for about 18h before culture improves the bacterial isolation rate.

9. Udder cleaning subsection: The information given here is already in the preceding subsection. Please remove or remove the same information in the preceding section.

#### RESULT section

10. Table 2, second column: heading should read "No. of mastitic cows examined"

11. It is good for the authors to include important selected plates (pictures) of the CMT reaction, bacterial culture and identification tests, and direct microscopic views of the bacterial isolates.

12. Risk factor subsection, line 7: transfer "from the age variable, the study concludes...." to the discussion section.

#### DISCUSSION section

13. Paragraph 4, line 2: It was stated that the findings of Kerro and Tareke (2003) showed that the risk of mastitis increases with age, doesn't this support, NOT CONTRADICT, your finding as you mentioned?

14. It's important for the authors to include a paragraph acknowledging some of the potential limitations of this study. One important limitation that needs to be acknowledged is that the California mastitis test (CMT) is only about 80% sensitive and specific, thereby suggesting that some false negative cases may have been excluded from the study, and some false positives added as cases of mastitis. Typically, CMT is used as a screening test, while the somatic cell count (SCC) provides a more sensitive and specific result.