

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_90804
Title of the Manuscript:	Isolation and Genetic characterization of Gram-negative bacteria from different fresh retail vegetables in Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://www.journalmrji.com/index.php/MRJI/editorial-policy>

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Abstract should be rewritten again (It is too shallow). Should include background information, clear methodology, result, discussion and finally conclusion. <i>[Additional comments are included within the document]</i> 2. The introduction section need synthesis of different literature to show the research gap. What is known about the topic? <i>[Additional comments are included within the document]</i> 3. Material and method section should be modified immensely? It does not clearly show how it was done. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A. What is the sample size determination formula used in this study? How do you select the listed vegetable samples? B. Authors should write the brand name of the media used C. How do the investigators select the listed antibiotics? 4. The result section should be accompanied by explanation in word and it is too shallow. Not publishable in this current form. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A. A total of one hundred and eight isolates were isolated from sixteen different retail leafy and salad vegetable samples. Identities of ten randomly obtained isolates? Why? Do you have all the isolates? If yes, it has to be submitted with the manuscript as a dataset. 5. The authors should attempt to compare the result with results previously published articles? [Discussion section] <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A. The main objective of this paper is "Genetic characterization of Gram-negative bacteria" but it lacks depth in discussion section? Authors should add points regarding this one? 6. Throughout the document there are bold statement without a reference 7. The authors used so many abbreviations but I can't find abbreviation and acronym section? 8. CONCLUSION should be written again? How do you conclude on this points and it is not your objective? If you want this information you have to show the method, introduction, and results? 	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Editorial errors 2. Grammatical mistakes 3. Scientific name writing problems 4. Lack of cohesiveness of the paragraphs 	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Samuel Chane Teferi
Department, University & Country	Salale University, Ethiopia