Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**Advances in Research**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AIR_107945**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Antibiotics susceptibility profile of biofilm forming bacteria isolated from soy bean milk drinks sold in Abakaliki Metropolis.**
Type of the Article	**Original Research Article**

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)*
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. The manuscript has potential for application and meets the requirements for publication in the Advances in Research. The authors made several mistakes, which I commented in some parts of the text. 2. The title of the article is suitable. 3. The abstract reflects the aim of the study with the achieved results, but there are stylistic and grammatical errors. The sentence is not grammatically correct: A total of 150 soy bean milk samples 15 from each location were collected…. Include in the abstract how many were positive samples because it is not clear from the sentence: The result showed that a total of 100 (66.6%) bacteria were…. Correct dot between sentences: biofilm producers . The antibiotics 4. Some subsections need to be edited. This part is weak: Identification and characterization of bacteria isolates from soy bean milk. In the methodology, it is necessary to describe the cultivation of bacteria on selective agars, additional tests for distinguishing species as the methods of their identification. More to describe statistical methods. Also, the results do not comment on significant differences in the detected izolates and tested bacteria for biofilm and resistance. In the results, describe how many positive samples there were. Describe and explain statistical significance in Table 1. From table 3, 4, 5 and 6 it is not clear how many isolates were tested for biofilm and resistance. At the beginning of the discussion, I lack characterized legislative standards for the number of individual bacteria count in soy milk and their comparison. I recommend adding and citing more recent literary sources after this sentence: Also, milk is a rich source of various nutrients. [22, 19], as it provide all the nutrients to sustain health, grow, protect and heal. The nutrients in milk serve as an ideal medium for microbial growth [23]. Links for recommended references: https://www.mdpi.com/2076-3417/11/7/3196 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/35861970/ The sentence in discussion is not confirmed in the results: Biofilm forming *Staphylococcus aureus* was resistant to penicillin 25 (100 %), cefoxitin 25 (100%), vancomycin 25 (100 %), oxacillin 25 (100 %), tetracycline 24 (96%) and Cefotaxime 16 (64.0 %) was relatively high compared to the other antibiotics … I suggest adding a table to the results to compare the resistance of isolates with and without biofilm formation. I also recommend adding and citing more recent literary sources after this sentence. Links for recommended references: https://www.mdpi.com/2306-7381/10/6/386 https://actavet.vfu.cz/92/2/189/same_authors/ I recommend adding more recent citations after the sentence: It's high level of resistance can be attributed to the ability of *Staphylococcus aureus* to form biofilm which confers its resistance to antibiotics [27, 5]. Links for recommended references: https://www.mdpi.com/2076-2615/12/4/470 https://potravinarstvo.com/journal1/index.php/potravinarstvo/article/view/905 The consumption of large amount of these biofilm forming bacteria in soybean milk could change the normal flora … Products should be sterile after processing. To explain what permissible microflora can be in soy milk. Does the legislation allow it? In conclusion, explain the abbreviation NAFDAC. 5. The manuscript is scientific correct however, I have reservations about individual sections (see comments above). Proofreading of the manuscript is needed. 6. Some references are old: Hauman, B. F. (1984), Gavin, M. and Wettstein, A. (1990), Alexander, B., Patrick, W., Stephane, M., Olivier, J., Karine, M., Jean, W., Dusko, E. and	

	Alexei, S. (2001), Henkel. J. (2000). I also recommend adding and citing more recent literary sources.	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	Proofreading of the manuscript is needed.	
Optional/General comments	I appreciate the good idea of the authors for mapping the current situation with the quality of soy beans milk sold in Abakaliki metropolis. However, some parts in the methodology, results and discussions need to be improved.	

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:	**František Zigo**
Department, University & Country	**University of Veterinary Medicine and Pharmacy, Slovakia**