Submission 1088. Peer-review process

Reviewer A

1. Does the paper comply with the scientific quality standards of its field?*

⦿ Yes

◯ No

2. Are the methods described in detail, so that the experiments are reproducible?*

⦿ Yes

◯ No

3. Is the statistical analysis of the data appropriate and technically sound?*

⦿ Yes

◯ No

3.1 If necessary, please, provide a brief explanation of your evaluation of the statistical methods used in the manuscript.

4. Are the claims/statements/conclusions fully supported by results?*

⦿ Yes

◯ No

◯ Partially

4.1 If not, please, indicate the additional evidence that would help accomplishing this requirement.

5. Are the claims/statements discussed rigorously, in the context of previous scientific literature and knowledge of the field? *

⦿ Yes

◯ No

6. If your recommended decision is to reject the manuscript in its actual version, is the study promising enough as to encourage the authors to re-submit after a major revision?*

⦿ Yes

◯ No

7. Is there any ethical concern related to experimental subjects (i. e. animals, humans)?*

○ Yes

○ No

8. Is there any evidence of manipulation of figures or images that compromise the scientific quality or reliability of the paper?*

○ Yes

○ No

9. Is the paper clearly written, following standard scientific English?*

◉ Yes

○ No

10. Have the authors made all experimental data fully available to readers?
This requirement can be accomplished through either supplementary files or by depositing data on public repositories.*

○ Yes

○ No

11. Based on paper content and your global appraisal of it, indicate the type of publication that best fits the manuscript.

◉ Original research article

○ Short communication

○ Review

12. I agree to review the updated version of the manuscript.*

◉ Yes

○ No

13. Comments to the editor. Please, include a brief report stating your general appraisal of the paper. Provide the reasons that support your recommended decision of acceptance, rejection or downgrading the paper to a research note.

The paper Prevalence, risk factors, and main characteristics of bruises in cattle from the Americas provides original information generated by a well designed meta-analysis. It is a cohesive, well-written and scientifically sound paper. The systematic review and meta-analysis have been appropriatedly conducted. Formatting is above average. Figures are very clear and nicely designed.
I recommend this paper to be accepted after minor revision.

14. Comments to authors (optional). Please, provide a constructive and thorough review of the sections. So, that the authors are able to prepare a revision ready for acceptance without incurring in multiple revision rounds.

Overall comments

The paper Prevalence, risk factors, and main characteristics of bruises in cattle from the Americas provides original information generated by a well designed meta-analysis. It is a cohesive, well-written and scientifically sound paper. The systematic review and meta-analysis have been appropriately conducted. Formatting is above average. Figures are very clear and nicely designed. Minor language issues and a few suggestions are further provided in specific comments.

Specific comments

Title: Considering that a systematic review is expected to be embedded in the concept of a well-conducted meta-analysis, I suggest changing the title to: Prevalence, risk factors, and main characteristics of bruises in cattle: a meta-analysis in the American continent. I personally don´t like the idea to use the term "The Americas" referring to North and South America as separate continents as there is no consensus among the experts in the field. I rather suggest authors to consider the term "American continent" or simply "America", regardless the north Americans like it or not.

Abstract:

Please include a general study design statement including the criteria for publication screening and selection.
Line 10: insert commas in numbers: 928,447
Line 15: "condemned meat" instead of "meat condemned"
Line 15: delete "the" in "among the intrinsic factors"
Line 21: replace "6/10" by "60%"

Introduction:

This section is very well written and clear.

Line 66: delete "of this region"
Line 66-71: please rephrase. It is a very long sentence. I suggest splitting it.
Line 86: "... can be used to infer both when the bruises were sustained and the mechanism that caused them

Material and methods

Line 96: "...we developed an a priori protocol"....
Line 106: There was no time limit for the search?
Line numbers are missing from page 8 on because of the section break (table on page 7)
The findings related to the overall agreement between the reviewers should cited in the "Results" section
Change "factors" by "factor classes" or "factor categories" in ..."for intrinsic and extrinsic risk factors. For both factor classes, we used all available causes from a single study and performed subgroups meta-analyses..."

Results

The findings were clearly presented in a logical reasoning.
In, "Among the 46 studies included".....replace by "among the 46 included studies"

Discussion

Delete the first two sentences as this info has been previously presented in Intro and Results, respectively. This happens throughout the discussion section, although it is more frequently observed in the first part of the discussion. Authors should avoid and focus on potential explanations for the findings. Although the discussion section is overall very well written, I suggest authors to discuss the findings according to the logical sequence that they have been presented in the previous section.

Conclusions

I suggest authors to shorten this section by providing the main implications and perspectives provided by the analysis.

Tables and Figures: these seem very well designed and informative. Nice job.

References: authors should notic

Completed: 2022-08-01 09:35 AM
Recommendation: Accept Submission

Reviewer B

1. Does the paper comply with the scientific quality standards of its field?*

⦿ Yes

○ No

2. Are the methods described in detail, so that the experiments are reproducible?*

⦿ Yes

○ No

3. Is the statistical analysis of the data appropriate and technically sound?*

⦿ Yes

○ No

3.1 If necessary, please, provide a brief explanation of your evaluation of the statistical methods used in the manuscript.

4. Are the claims/statements/conclusions fully supported by results?*

◉ Yes

○ No

○ Partially

4.1 If not, please, indicate the additional evidence that would help accomplishing this requirement.

5. Are the claims/statements discussed rigorously, in the context of previous scientific literature and knowledge of the field? *

◉ Yes

○ No

6. If your recommended decision is to reject the manuscript in its actual version, is the study promising enough as to encourage the authors to re-submit after a major revision?*

◉ Yes

○ No

7. Is there any ethical concern related to experimental subjects (i. e. animals, humans)?*

○ Yes

○ No

8. Is there any evidence of manipulation of figures or images that compromise the scientific quality or reliability of the paper?*

○ Yes

○ No

9. Is the paper clearly written, following standard scientific English?*

◉ Yes

○ No

10. Have the authors made all experimental data fully available to readers?
This requirement can be accomplished through either supplementary files or by depositing data on public repositories.*

○ Yes

◉ No

11. Based on paper content and your global appraisal of it, indicate the type of publication that best fits the manuscript.

◉   Original research article

◯   Short communication

◯   Review

12. I agree to review the updated version of the manuscript.*

◉   Yes

◯   No

13. Comments to the editor. Please, include a brief report stating your general appraisal of the paper. Provide the reasons that support your recommended decision of acceptance, rejection or downgrading the paper to a research note.

Manuscript

The impact of deviation of the stun shot from the ideal point on cattle skull on motor paralysis

In this manuscript the authors addressed an important subject, by carrying out a systematic review and meta-analysis of scientific studies conducted in the Americas reporting the prevalence of bruising in cattle, their risk factors and main characteristics. The manuscript is well written and address a subject of practical importance, dealing with important issues related to meat and animal welfare sciences.

Some few points must be reviewed in the manuscript to make it ready for publication, as follow:

Key words:
- Remove/replace "cattle" and "risk factors", which are already included in the title.

Introduction
- L82 - Is "presence of horns" really intrinsic? I ask this because the presence of horns in one animal increases the risk of bruises in the others, but not in itself. Think about

Material and methods
- After Table 1 the line numbers disappeared, and the page numbers restart from 1.
- P1 (after Table 1) – Last paragraph – Higgins, Thomas. Is this the right way to cite Higgins et al. (20)?

Discussion
- P16 – First paragraph – Rebagliati, Ballerio. Is this the right way to cite Rebagliati et al. (38)?

Limitations
- P20 – First paragraph – Balshem et al. 2011 - This citation should be numbered and included in the references.

References
- The DOI of most references are missed.

14. Comments to authors (optional). Please, provide a constructive and thorough review of the sections. So, that the authors are able to prepare a revision ready for acceptance without incurring in multiple revision rounds.

Additional comments

Title

Since the review is limited to Bos taurus cattle, this should be informed in the title

Introduction:

L70-72. Why to limit to the papers published from the year 2000, if some good recommendations about safe cattle handling procedures were developed before this year? Justify.

L85. Where is the "target legislative area"? Inform.

Material and methods

Figure 1. I suggest removing Figure 1, since all information shown in it are repeated in L149-158 or, alternatively, consider removing the sub-section 3.1 paragraph (L149 -158).

Results and discussion

L480-488. I did not understand why to include these information here, since they cannot be characterized as manuscript limitations. Think about.

Conclusions

L497. Replace "to identify" to "searching for".

Completed: 2022-06-27 01:17 PM
Recommendation: Revisions Required

Reviewer C

1. Does the paper comply with the scientific quality standards of its field?*

◉ Yes

○ No

2. Are the methods described in detail, so that the experiments are reproducible?*

◉ Yes

○ No

3. Is the statistical analysis of the data appropriate and technically sound?*

◉ Yes

○ No

3.1 If necessary, please, provide a brief explanation of your evaluation of the statistical methods used in the manuscript.

4. Are the claims/statements/conclusions fully supported by results?*

◉ Yes

○ No

○ Partially

4.1 If not, please, indicate the additional evidence that would help accomplishing this requirement.

5. Are the claims/statements discussed rigorously, in the context of previous scientific literature and knowledge of the field? *

◉ Yes

○ No

6. If your recommended decision is to reject the manuscript in its actual version, is the study promising enough as to encourage the authors to re-submit after a major revision?*

◉ Yes

○ No

7. Is there any ethical concern related to experimental subjects (i. e. animals, humans)?*

○ Yes

◉ No

8. Is there any evidence of manipulation of figures or images that compromise the scientific quality or reliability of the paper?*

○ Yes

⦿ No

9. Is the paper clearly written, following standard scientific English?*

⦿ Yes

○ No

10. Have the authors made all experimental data fully available to readers?
This requirement can be accomplished through either supplementary files or by depositing data on public repositories.*

⦿ Yes

○ No

11. Based on paper content and your global appraisal of it, indicate the type of publication that best fits the manuscript.

⦿ Original research article

○ Short communication

○ Review

12. I agree to review the updated version of the manuscript.*

⦿ Yes

○ No

13. Comments to the editor. Please, include a brief report stating your general appraisal of the paper. Provide the reasons that support your recommended decision of acceptance, rejection or downgrading the paper to a research note.

The article is evidence of arduous and high-quality research.
This research, despite having some limitations, which are recognized by the authors, contributes significantly to highlighting the prevalence of bruises in animals close to slaughter in the Americas as a serious problem.
Furthermore, based on its own limitations, it makes recommendations for future research.
It adequately applies the PRISMA protocol and its meta-analysis meets some high-quality criteria, such as:
repeatability of the study selection procedure,
Complete list of selected studies;
Analysis of variability between studies;
Analysis of publication bias;
Data accessibility.

14. Comments to authors (optional). Please, provide a constructive and thorough review of the sections. So, that the authors are able to prepare a revision ready for acceptance without incurring in multiple revision rounds.

- Table number two is not in the document, it needs to be added.

- A better definition of "high risk" and "low risk" is needed when classifying studies reporting multiple arms for a single risk factor.

Completed: 2022-07-26 04:04 PM
Recommendation: Revisions Required

Editor decision: Revisions required.

From: "Enrique Jesús Delgado Suárez" <vetmexicooa@fmvz.unam.mx>
To: "Jaime N. Sanchez" <jnsanchez25@gmail.com>, "Briseyda J. Félix" <leebris@gmail.com>, "José R. Rosiles" <toxrosiles@yahoo.com.mx>, "Arnulfo Montero" <arnulfo.montero@uas.edu.mx>, "Ana C. Strappini" <anastrappini@uach.cl>, "Carmen Gallo" <cgallo@uach.cl>, "Juan C. Robles" <jcrobles@uas.edu.mx>, "Jesus J. Portillo" <portillo6422@uas.edu.mx>, "Daniel D." <ddiaz@ciencias.unam.mx>, "Horacio Dávila" <davila-ramos@uas.edu.mx>

Subject: [Vet Mex] Editor Decision

Jaime N. Sanchez, Briseyda J. Félix, José R. Rosiles, Arnulfo Montero, Ana C. Strappini, Carmen Gallo, Juan C. Robles, Jesus J. Portillo, Daniel D., Horacio Dávila:

Reviewers have commented on your submission to Veterinaria México OA, "Prevalence, risk factors, and main characteristics of bruises in cattle from the Americas". I am pleased to inform that we shall be happy to publish a suitably revised version of your manuscript. Reviewers have requested minor revisions that should be easily addressed (see below). Therefore, we invite you to submit a revised version of the paper that addresses the points raised during the review process. We kindly suggest the revised version by September 1st 2022. If you will need more time than this to complete your revisions, please reply to this message.

Please, include the following items when submitting your revised manuscript:

- A marked-up copy of your manuscript that highlights changes made to the original version. You may use the "track changes" tool of Microsoft Word. However, make sure your name does not appear as the author of the document, to ensure the blind review process. Besides, do not include the authors and their affiliations in this document. As it will only be used for review, it should come with the title, followed by the abstract right away. Please, upload this as a separate file labeled "**Revisedpaper_trackedchanges_1088_R2.docx**"

- An unmarked version of your revised paper without tracked changes. Please, upload this as a separate file labeled "**Revisedpaper_1088_R2.docx**"

Please, do not submit your revised paper as a new submission to avoid having duplicates in the journal system. Moreover, notice that the reviewer is citing specific lines of your manuscript in several comments. The review version PDF file used by reviewers is available for you under the "Review discussions" section. Thank you for submitting your work to Veterinaria México OA.

Kind regards,

Enrique Jesús Delgado Suárez
vetmexicooa@fmvz.unam.mx

2022-08-01

ANSWERS TO REVIEWERS

2022-08-03

Estimado Enrique, me da gusto saludarte, deseo que te encuentres muy bien.

Con mucho gusto recibimos la noticia sobre la decisión de nuestro estudio. Hemos trabajado muy fuerte para lograr la versión revisada del manuscrito, esperamos que sea del agrado de los revisores para que el documento sea aceptado para su publicación en la revista.

Adjunto encontrarás nuestra carta de respuesta a los revisores, contiente una lista detallada de cada uno de los comentarios, solicitudes y críticas hechas por ellos.

Te quiero comentar un par de errores que cometí al momento de enviar la primera versión del documento:

1) no agregué dentro del sistema a la tercera autora del documento (Velazquez-Valdez, D.Z.), me dí cuenta debido a que no recibió el correo con la decisión sobre el documento. Puedes corroborar que dicha autora está en la lista original de autores revisando el cover letter que adjunté durante el envío original

2) al momento de enviar el documento, no me agregué como autor de correspondencia junto con el Prof. Horacio Davila-Ramos. Como te mencioné en nuestra reunión pasada, estoy trabajado en todas mis colaboraciones compartiendo la corresponsalia de los

documentos, ya que yo conozco la metodología y mis colegas tienen el expertise en el tema.

Espero que no haya problema con ambos errores.

Te envío un cordial saludo,

Daniel

Editor decision Accept Submission
2022-08-19

From: "Enrique Jesús Delgado Suárez" <vetmexicooa@fmvz.unam.mx>

To: "Jaime N. Sanchez" <jnsanchez25@gmail.com>, "Briseyda J. Félix" <leebris@gmail.com>, "José R. Rosiles" <toxrosiles@yahoo.com.mx>, "Arnulfo Montero" <arnulfo.montero@uas.edu.mx>, "Ana C. Strappini" <anastrappini@uach.cl>, "Carmen Gallo" <cgallo@uach.cl>, "Juan C. Robles" <jcrobles@uas.edu.mx>, "Jesus J. Portillo" <portillo6422@uas.edu.mx>, "Daniel D." <ddiaz@ciencias.unam.mx>, "Horacio Dávila" davila-ramos@uas.edu.mx

Subject: [Vet Mex] Editor Decision

Jaime N. Sanchez, Briseyda J. Félix, José R. Rosiles, Arnulfo Montero, Ana C. Strappini, Carmen Gallo, Juan C. Robles, Jesus J. Portillo, Daniel D., Horacio Dávila:

Regarding your submission to Veterinaria México OA, "Prevalence, risk factors, and main characteristics of bruises in cattle from the Americas", I am pleased to inform you that, based on reviewers recommendations, it has been accepted for publication.

The manuscript will enter now the copyediting stage (it may last several weeks). Journal staff will contact you in case of adjustments to the document are needed, as well as to seek your approval of the final proof.

Thank you for publishing your work in Veterinaria México OA. We hope to have further contributions from you in the near future.

Enrique Jesús Delgado Suárez
vetmexicooa@fmvz.unam.mx