# Review of: "A Dataset of Small-Mammal Detections in West Africa and Their Associated Micro-Organisms"

Stefano Catalano[1]

1 University of Glasgow

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This is cool, a piece of work that could really complement current datasets and that could guide control efforts. I have made several remarks for each section, and, in general, I find that more effort could have gone into the writing. Keep up the good work; it'll get there!

ABSTRACT:

Either remove IUCN and GBIF or spell out in full.

Here, 14 countries are mentioned, but the last paragraph of the Introduction states that this study was conducted across 17 countries. Please clarify.

CONTEXT:

The grammar should be revised, including scientific names in italics (I think Lassa mammarenavirus is correct in italics, but sp. from Leptospira should not be in italics), and disease names should not be capitalized.

See above for 14 VS 17 African countries.

The last sentence seems more appropriate for the Reuse Potential section.

METHODS:

Why 1964?

Provide a definition of “exploded keywords” since the chosen keywords may be an issue: 1) “Rodent” and “Rodent trap” seem redundant since the first automatically includes the second; 2) unless exploded keywords address the issue, these keywords may be excluding studies which only contain words like Rodents, Roentia, or West African.

In the country list, there are 16 countries, neither 17 nor 14 as stated previously.

Is this work about rodents or small mammals? Most rodents are small mammals, but not all small mammals are rodents.

In the Abstract, the authors stated that the included studies had identified the rodents to the species level, whereas here, also their genus seems to be included. Please clarify.

How did the authors objectively make the distinction between credible and non-credible organisations?

No details about the standardised tool used for data extraction have been provided.

DATA VALIDATION AND QUALITY CONTROL:

Accurate species identification is a strong assumption, and the authors should at least acknowledge that some species remain impossible to unequivocally identify in the absence of molecular testing.

Some sentences in the second paragraph were unclear.

DATA PROCESSING AND EXPLORATION:

There is no reference to the results of the study (e.g., numbers of papers included after primary and full-text screenings).