

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Microbiology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMB_95909</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Phenotypic Detection of AmpC beta-lactamase producing Escherichia coli among Patients in Hospital Wards</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> )

### 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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. <b>Yes, it is. AmpC is one of the important beta-lactamases in GNR. However, no study and description of other more important ones, ESBL and carbapenemase was found.</b></p> <p><b>Yes.</b></p> <p><b>Yes, but it is too lengthy. It should be more concise.</b></p> <p><b>Yes.</b></p> <p><b>Yes, but authors showed detection of AmpC by only phenotypic methods, but not genetically. There is a possibility of containing inaccuracy.</b></p> <p><b>Yes.</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>No, it is not. Poor descriptions are found in sentences and phrases throughout the manuscript, even in the first sentence of Abstract. Native speaker who is familiar with scientific literatures should check this manuscript.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Overall, this manuscript is unnecessarily too lengthy. Authors' work in this study is limited. Thus, Methods section, Results, Discussion can be shortened substantially to be more concise and simple. In Resuklt section 3.1., the main text repeated the numbers and percentages shown in Table 1. Do not repeat. Only important numbers should be written in the text.</p> <p>Results 3.1. "The frequency distribution of bacteria..." meaning of this sentence is totally unclear.</p> <p>Authors should discuss presumptive prevalence of ESBLs among E. coli.</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Nobumichi Kobayashi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Sapporo Medical University, Japan</b>