

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Pathogen Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPR_97237
Title of the Manuscript:	ANTIBIOTICS PROFILE AND PUBLIC HEALTH IMPLICATION OF PATHOGENIC ENTERIC BACTERIA ASSOCIATED WITH POULTRY STOOL DROPPINGS
Type of the 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.journalijpr.com/index.php/IJPR/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. I believe so because, even using only classical Microbiology techniques, the relevance of the results is an alert to the community. I recognize the indisputable importance of molecular techniques, but I deeply value the foundations of Microbiology. 2. Yes. 3. Yes. 4. Almost entirely. There are some words that should be revised regarding the need to use a capital letter at the beginning (MATERIALS AND METHOD section). 5. Yes. 6. The references are quite outdated. Approximately 40% of them have been published for more than ten years. I recommend that most of the references be re-read and updated.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes.	
Optional/General 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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Clarisse Maximo Arpini Costa
Department, University & Country	Universidade Vila Velha, Brazil