

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Microbiology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMB_98046</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>OPTIMIZATION OF ESCHERICHIA COLI BACTERIOPHAGES PRODUCTION</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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.journaljamb.com/index.php/JAMB/editorial-policy> )

## Review Form 1.7

### 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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. <b>Yes, but needs major corrections.</b> Yes. <b>ALL CHANGES MUST BE HIGHLIGHTED.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please use bacteriophage propaganda/multiplication instead of bacteriophage growth all over the manuscript since viruses are not alive microorganisms.</li> <li>• All abbreviations must be present in full for the first time they used.</li> <li>• In Abstract, Aims, the following statement is not verified and hence should be modified: "Phage therapy is best alternative to antibiotics in poultry."</li> <li>• The following sentences in Introduction belong to Discussion: "In a study of Barrow et al. [4], bacteriophage R, was effective in preventing and treating infections in chickens. Huff et al. [5] have demonstrated that aerosol spray of bacteriophages administered to 7-day-old chickens prior to the triple challenge with E. coli can prevent infections caused by E. coli. Tawakol et al. [6] showed that bacteriophage treatment reduced the severity and prevented the mortality."</li> <li>• Countries of device/material manufacturers' must be addressed.</li> <li>• Where was the study carried out?</li> <li>• In Phage production at flask level, 5 ml pure <i>E. coli</i> culture with what concentration in McFarland scale?</li> <li>• In Phage production at flask level, 10,100 microlitres of 10<sup>2</sup> dilution...?!!</li> <li>• Table 3 is missing!</li> <li>• Figure 2, scale of X axis is not clear.</li> <li>• Figure 3, scales of X and Y axes are not clear.</li> <li>• In Results, all significances (<i>p</i>-values) must be addressed when any comparisons are made.</li> <li>• In Results, assessment results of following parameters are missing: carbon source, nitrogen source and calcium divalent cation.</li> <li>• Discussion includes several repetitions! (e.g., four factors such as Temperature, Shaking, Glycerol content and Incubation time are selected for the study).</li> <li>• In Discussion, the present results (each by each) must be compared with results from other studies. Currently, Discussion is too short, lacking sufficient information.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	No, must carefully be revised.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### PART 2:

	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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ramin Mazaheri Nezhad Fard</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Iran</b>