

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_102467
Title of the Manuscript:	Pisciculture and Fish parts as non-clinical Source of CTX-M and TEM Extended Spectrum Beta-lactamases producing Escherichia coli in Southeastern 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.journalajfar.com/index.php/AJFAR/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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes</p> <p>2. S should be added to non-clinical source in the title to read "Pisciculture and Fish parts as non-clinical Sources of CTX-M and TEM Extended Spectrum Beta-lactamases producing Escherichia coli in Southeastern Nigeria"</p> <p>3. Yes</p> <p>4. Yes</p> <p>5. Yes</p> <p>6. Yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Suitable</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. How were the isolates of E. coli confirmed after growing them on Brilliance agar? How were the authors certain that they isolated E. coli without further confirmation?</p> <p>2. What is AMC?</p> <p>3. The ESBL detection method is not correct. Was the experiment controlled?</p> <p>4. Why the focus on only two types of ESBL? There are other types that the authors did not investigate.</p> <p>5. How did the authors ensure that isolates are not repeated. It is possible to isolate the same organism from different parts of the fish</p> <p>6. The major issues with this study is the inability of the authors to provide information about the resistance profiles of the isolates. These can be correlated with the detected genes.</p> <p>7. Authors stated only the p values. The test statistics value should also be stated</p>	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Odetoyin Babatunde
Department, University & Country	Obafemi Awolowo University, Nigeria