

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Advances in Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AIR_102468</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Distribution and Antibiotic Resistance profile of Extended Spectrum Beta-lactamase Producing Escherichia coli from fish farm within Abakaliki Metropolis</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.journalair.com/index.php/AIR/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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. Antibiotics are now a big problem for humanity. And such a resource as seafood during cultivation, unfortunately, has not yet been sufficiently studied for the presence of strains of microorganisms (especially when, as an indicator of pollution), resistant to the action of certain classes of chemical preparations. The authors have done a good job of expanding knowledge in this field</p> <p>2. In my opinion, the title of the manuscript is absolutely appropriate for the submitted text and I have no alternative</p> <p>3. Yes, the article abstract is absolutely comprehensive</p> <p>4. The article structure is right for the article in my mind</p> <p>5. As the scientific side, article is absolutely correct and understanding</p> <p>6. The references are well</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	The English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>I did not see any position about statistic measuring. But its should be appropriate.</p> <p>The results here presented merit and good commenters. I agree with the strong claims that the author has made.</p> <p>The structure of the article is clear and well organized. The title, abstract, introduction, headings, subheadings, opening sentences, and conclusion of the article are well.</p> <p>Abstract gives an overview of the study's purpose, links with Materials and Methods.</p> <p>The authors identify gaps in the existing literature and tell us how the current study will fill that problem in the Introduction section of the article.</p> <p>In my opinion, the manuscript is suitable for publication. Overall, this is a good paper.</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Olena Grechana
Department, University & Country	Zaporizhzhya State Medical University, Ukraine