

Submission 1150. Peer-review process

Reviewer B

Round 1

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

Yes

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

Yes

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

No

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

There is no intra-operator reliability for the image processing. Although all analyses were done by the same individual, what was the correlation of repeated labeling of the same image? what was the correlation between repeated labeling of two images of the same ewe? If the operator can't consistently find the same point twice, then that may explain the low R2 of the prediction equations.

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

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

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

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

No

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

No

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

Yes

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.

No

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

Short communication

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

Yes

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 is interesting in and off itself. I recommend minor changes and resubmission. I think it could be published as a short communication given the small sample size and limited scope of utility (one breed and one farm). But it may be useful as a proof of concept communication.

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.

This paper addresses the use of DIA for biometrics in one breed of hair sheep.

The paper addresses an important issue: non-invasive biometric measurement in hair sheep. but it does so with a very limited sample size, thus the results are hardly generalizable. Yet, I think it is worth publishing it and provide some suggestions for revision and resubmission.

1) address the intra operator reliability: if the same operator labels two images of the same ewe or even the same set of images several times, what is the concordance?

2) why are the regression coefficients in table 2 and 3 different?

Formatting issues:

3) table 1 and 2 are hard to read due to text wrapping into a second line, please avoid that.

3) in line 188 and 264 there is an expression that does not look right: $r^2 > 0.18$; $<$ and < 0.55 . Please rewrite.

Completed: 2023-01-19 09:32 AM

Recommendation: Revisions Required

Reviewer D:

Round 1

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

Yes

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

Yes

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

Yes

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

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

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

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

No

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

No

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

Yes

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

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

Original research article

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

Yes

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.

This paper has an interesting approach to reducing stress and time in the measurement process for this production. The introduction context is good, and the research question and justification are enough for me. The extension approach would be helpful to production. I am satisfied with the statistical analysis and results; the discussion and conclusions are congruent and sufficient.

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.

In general terms, the experimental design and the paper have a good approach. I only have one question, could the estimates be more accurate if the operator effect had been included in the estimation model? The above by including another operator in the process.

Completed: 2023-01-31 10:36 AM

Recommendation: Accept Submission

Section Editor Recommendation:

Enrique Jesús Delgado Suárez, Miguel Cuevas Díaz:

The recommendation regarding the submission to Veterinaria México OA, "Predictive biometrics of hair sheep through digital imaging" is: Request Revisions

Completed: 2023-01-31

Editor Decision Round 1:

To: "Alfonso J. Chay-Canul" <alfonso.chay@ujat.mx>, "Jorge Tapia González" <jorgetapiaglez@gmail.com>, "Jorge Canul-Solís" <jcanul31@gmail.com>, "Fernando Casanova-Lugo" <fkzanov@gmail.com>, "Ángel T. Piñeiro-Vázquez" <angel.pineiro@itconkal.edu.mx>, "Rodrigo Portillo-Salgado" <portillo.rodrigo@colpos.mx>, "Ricardo García-Herrera" <ricardogarciaherrera@hotmail.com>, "Einar Vargas-Bello-Pérez" e.vargasbelloperez@reading.ac.uk

Subject: [VMOA] Editor Decision

Alfonso J. Chay-Canul, Jorge Tapia González, Jorge Canul-Solís, Fernando Casanova-Lugo, Ángel T. Piñeiro-Vázquez, Rodrigo Portillo-Salgado, Ricardo García-Herrera, Einar Vargas-Bello-Pérez:

Reviewers have commented on your submission to Veterinaria México OA, "Predictive biometrics of hair sheep through digital imaging". Reviewers have requested revisions that should be addressed (see below) before the submission is accepted for publication. 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 March 10 2023. If you will need more time than this to complete your revisions, please reply to this message.

Please, upload the following items in the "**Revisions**" section when submitting your revised manuscript:

- 1) A rebuttal letter that responds to each point raised by reviewers. Please, upload this letter as a separate file labeled "**1150-RR1-yyyymmdd.docx**"
- 2) 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 "**1150-VCA-R1-TC-yyyymmdd.docx**"
- 3) An unmarked version of your revised paper without tracked changes. Please, upload this as a separate file labeled "**1150-VCA-R1-yyyymmdd.docx**"

Notice **yyyymmdd corresponds to the date when the author is submitting the revised manuscript.*

Please, do not submit your revised paper as a new submission to avoid having duplicates in the journal system. Moreover, notice that reviewers may cite specific lines of your manuscript in their comments. For your reference, the review version PDF file used by reviewers is attached to this message.

Thank you for submitting your work to Veterinaria México OA.

Kind regards,

Completed: 2023-02-10

Answer to reviewers:

Revisions

1. There is no intra-operator reliability for the image processing. Although all analyses were done by the same individual, what was the correlation of repeated labeling of the same image? what was the correlation between repeated labeling of two images of the same ewe? If the operator can't consistently find the same point twice, then that may explain the low R² of the prediction equations.

Authors: The digital body measures were highly correlated (>0.95) between each image labelling. This was inserted before Table 1.

2. The paper is interesting in and of itself. I recommend minor changes and resubmission. I think it could be published as a short communication given the small sample size and limited scope of utility (one breed and one farm). But it may be useful as a proof of concept communication.

Authors: thank you

3. The paper addresses an important issue: non-invasive biometric measurement in hair sheep. but it does so with a very limited sample size, thus the results are hardly generalizable. Yet, I think it is worth publishing it and provide some suggestions for revision and resubmission.

address the intra operator reliability: if the same operator labels two images of the same ewe or even the same set of images several times, what is the concordance?

Authors: The digital body measures were highly correlated (>0.95) between each image labelling. This was inserted before Table 1.

why are the regression coefficients in table 2 and 3 different?

Authors: this was corrected

Table 2 - r²: determination coefficient to predict the biometric measurement.

Table 3 - r²: determination coefficient for the observed vs. predicted values.

4. Formatting issues:

4.1) table 1 and 2 are hard to read due to text wrapping into a second line, please avoid that.

Authors: this was improved

4.2) in line 188 and 264 there is an expression that does not look right: $r^2 > 0.18$; $<$ and < 0.55 . Please rewrite.

Authors: this was revised as $r^2 > 0.18 \leq$ and $r^2 \leq 0.55$, see line 219 and 294

This paper has an interesting approach to reducing stress and time in the measurement process for this production. The introduction context is good, and the research question and justification are enough for me. The extension

approach would be helpful to production. I am satisfied with the statistical analysis and results; the discussion and conclusions are congruent and sufficient.

In general terms, the experimental design and the paper have a good approach. I only have one question, could the estimates be more accurate if the operator effect had been included in the estimation model? The above by including another operator in the process.

Author: for the analyzed model, the operator effect was not included as there was only one and the digital body measures were highly correlated (>0.95) between each image labelling.

Completed: March 15, 2023

Reviewer D

Round 2

Completed: 2023-04-24

Recommendation: Accept Submission

Reviewer D comments Round 2: I accept the manuscript. Congratulations for the effort. Regards

Section Editor recommendation

Enrique Jesús Delgado Suárez, Miguel Cuevas Díaz:

The recommendation regarding the submission to Veterinaria México OA, "Predictive biometrics of hair sheep through digital imaging" is: Accept Submission

Completed: 2023-04-25 01:23 PM

Editor Decision Round 2

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

To: "Alfonso J. Chay-Canul" <alfonso.chay@ujat.mx>, "Jorge Tapia González" <jorgetapiaglez@gmail.com>, "Jorge Canul-Solís" <jcanul31@gmail.com>, "Fernando Casanova-Lugo" <fkzanov@gmail.com>, "Ángel T. Piñeiro-Vázquez" <angel.pineiro@itconkal.edu.mx>, "Rodrigo Portillo-Salgado" <portillo.rodrigo@colpos.mx>, "Ricardo García-Herrera" <ricardogarciaherrera@hotmail.com>, "Einar Vargas-Bello-Pérez" e.vargasbelloperez@reading.ac.uk

Subject: [VMOA] Editor Decision

Alfonso J. Chay-Canul, Jorge Tapia González, Jorge Canul-Solís, Fernando Casanova-Lugo, Ángel T. Piñeiro-Vázquez, Rodrigo Portillo-Salgado, Ricardo García-Herrera, Einar Vargas-Bello-Pérez:

Regarding your submission to Veterinaria México OA, "Predictive biometrics of hair sheep through digital imaging", 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.

Dr. Enrique J. Delgado Suárez
Editor in Chief
Veterinaria México OA

Completed: 2023-07-27