Reviewer A:

Comment: Needs some language corrections
Response: *Thanks for your suggestion and revised accordingly.*

Comment: The manuscript is interesting and helps to understand this very important problem. I have given suggestions for improvement in the attached manuscript.
Response: *Thanks for your suggestion and we have addressed your comments in the revised manuscript.*

Comment: You should add that farmers were also interviewed and this should be in the title.
Response: *Thanks for your suggestion. We have revised title considering your suggestion.*

Comment: Structured abstract.
Response: *Thanks for your suggestion. We have revised the abstract section.*

Comment: Vancouver.
Response: *We have updated references using Vancouver style.*

Comment: A paragraph on why this pathology is important in public or human health is missing, since according to the journal's guidelines, there should be a multidisciplinary approach.
Response: *We agree with your suggestions and we included a statement mentioning public health significance under introduction section.*

Comment: Impersonal wording is preferable.
Response: *We have revised it considering your suggestion.*

Comment: Include the number of researchers or data collectors involved and their qualifications or training could help assess the reliability of the data.
Response: *A veterinarian and a research assistant collected sample and data. We added this information in the revised manuscript.*

Comment: It would be useful to provide more details on the specific inclusion and exclusion criteria for dairy farms and lactating cows. The criteria mentioned are minimal; Providing additional details may improve understanding of the study sample selection process.
Response: *Thanks for your suggestions. We have revised this section following your guidance.*

Comment: This should be in the results section. There should be no results in methods.
Response: *We agree with you. We have removed this part and revised result section.*

Comment: It is appropriate to mention the approval number of the Ethics Committee and a statement of animal ethics. The consent of the workers surveyed should also be mentioned.
Response: *Thanks for your suggestions. The research review committee of Quality Control Laboratory, Department of Livestock Services (DLS) in Bangladesh reviewed and approved study protocol. No approval number was given. The consent of the surveyed workers has been included in the revised manuscript.*

Comment: Although data collection using a questionnaire is mentioned, it would be helpful to include a brief description of the content of the questionnaire and how it was administered in the methods section.
Response: *Thanks for your suggestions. We added more information in the revised manuscript.*

Reviewer B:

Comment: It seems to me that specifying the location of the selected farms a little more would be correct, such as “farms in the central region of Bangladesh”
Response: *We have specified study area considering your suggestion.*

Comment: It is recommended to use some connectors in the text so that the ideas of each sentence can be fluid. Likewise, some redundancies are observed in the text, for example at the end of the first paragraph.
"During subclinical mastitis, the milk may appear normal, but the somatic cell count will be higher. When subclinical mastitis occurs, there are no obvious signs of abnormal milk or udders, but there is a high somatic cell count..."
It is also recommended to make correct use of abbreviations, for example at the beginning of the first paragraph "In most dairy herds, SCM causes the..." when the meaning is not previously mentioned.
Response: *Thanks for sharing your concerns. We have removed unnecessary texts and revised the sentence with appropriate meaning.*

Comment: Improve the writing so that the ideas do not sound repetitive, in the same way, I understand that the cows selected were apparently healthy, and not healthy as stated in the text "We collected a total of 320 quarter milk samples were collected from each quarter of 80 randomly chosen healthy dairy cows"
It would be advisable to add the moment in which the sample was taken. The results mention that two milkings are carried out a day. Was the sample taken during the first or second milking?
Response: *Thanks for your suggestion. We agree with you. We have placed this info in result section.*

Comment: It seems to me that tables 1 and 2 can be joined to avoid redundancy, likewise it would be advisable to add a column with the results of the average somatic cell count for each subarea.
Response: *Thanks for your valuable suggestion. We have merged table 1 and 2 in the revised manuscript.*

Comment: If the discussion could be added in relation to the somatic cell count. On the other hand, adding the battery species involved in subclinical mastitis would further enrich the discussion.
Response: *Thanks for your suggestion. We have added more information in the revised manuscript.*

Comment: It is recommended to specify that these results found were in Bangladeshi farms.
Response: *Thanks for your suggestion. We have addressed it in the revised manuscript.*

Comment: Both the citations and the bibliography do not correspond to Vancouver, attention must also be paid to the correct writing of the scientific names, these are in italics, which must be corrected in Leitner et al. (2003).
Response: *We have updated references using Vancouver style.*

Comment: One of the main weaknesses is the recurrent lack of use of connectors between sentences, which makes reading difficult because the ideas are cut off and begin with another concept. Similarly, redundancy is observed in some paragraphs.
Response: *We have tried to address this issue in the revised manuscript.*