

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_95254
Title of the Manuscript:	Staphylococcus species Isolated from Abattoir in Obio/Akpor and Eleme Local Government Areas of Rivers State
Type of the Article	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.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><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes. As it describes the prevalence of Staphylococcus species, which have a significant public health concern. Information on the prevalence of these microorganisms in slaughterhouse environment may help for future analysis of risk factors that facilitate colonization and spread of such pathogens. 2. Yes. 3. Yes, subject to reviewing the abstract after adjusting the results. 4. Not all sections. Please see the side comments in the main manuscript. <p><u>Abstract:</u> Should be revised according to important results I recommend the author to add keywords and avoid repeat the same words of title.</p> <p><u>Introduction:</u> Please divide the introduction into 3 paragraphs i.e., 1. introduction 2. significance of the study and 3. aim of the study.</p> <p><u>M &M:</u> Please add informed consent and ethical approval statement in Material and methods section. The total sample number not clear, if it is 20 samples, this sample size is small and I do recommend the author to increase it to be more convenient. Please describe the formula used for estimation/calculation of bacteria in the sample. Explain the characteristics for selection of different isolates form one sample that and how could you confirm such difference? The author should add some suitable new references in this section (see side comments) There is no section for statistical analysis There are several side comments attached in the main manuscript, for your reference.</p> <p><u>Results:</u> The results section need to be revised to avoid providing data that is not critical to answering the research question. The author should refer to the most important results achieved by referring to the tables or figures that contain these data by a highlighting statement or statements, which point out and describe the relevant or significant data. The author should describe the important results in the text then referring to relevant table or figure. The tables should be put into a contextual framework in the corresponding text. There are further side comments attached in the main manuscript, for your reference.</p> <p><u>Discussion:</u> As the author used a separated discussion section, he should be interpreting the important findings without referring to the relevant table or figure. The discussion is not clear and mix it with the result, I think the author has used the same way to write this paper without caring about special requirements for each part of the article. You cannot write the results same discussion etc...</p> <p>What are expected or not expected outcomes from the present study and why? What further predictions can be gleaned from the results?</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>5. Somewhat, yes, because there is no statistical analysis section, and the author not mentioned which method he used. The tables not clear and need to be revised with corresponding results in the text section. Although Antibiotic resistance is very important in staphylococcal infection, The author not studied the resistance profile of isolates.</p> <p>6. No. The author should add recent references, particularly, in introduction section.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	Yes.	
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	The Author needs to organize paragraphs in good condition. Please split the long sentences throughout the text into two to make it clear. Most of the suggestions appear as side comments and track changes in the attached manuscript file.	

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:	Abdullah O. Alhatami
Department, University & Country	University of Kufa, Iraq