

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Research in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJRM_106066
Title of the Manuscript:	MICROBIOLOGY OF ANTIBIOTIC RESISTANT BACTERIA FROM ORGANIC FERTILIZED FARM SOILS AND WATERLEAF (<i>Talinum triangulare</i>) IN ALUU, RIVERS STATE.
Type of the 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)
<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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The importance of the manuscript for the scientific community cannot be determined without access to the actual content. It's crucial that the manuscript contributes novel insights, addresses a relevant research question, or presents significant advancements in the field to be considered important.</p> <p>The suitability of the title depends on the content of the manuscript. If you provide the current title, I could suggest an alternative, but a suitable title should accurately reflect the research and catch the reader's interest.</p> <p>Without the abstract text, I can't evaluate its comprehensiveness. A good abstract should concisely summarize the research problem, methodology, key results, and conclusions.</p> <p>The appropriateness of subsections and structure depends on the content's organization. A well-structured manuscript should have clear headings and subheadings, guiding the reader through the logical flow of the research.</p> <p>I can't determine the scientific correctness without reviewing the actual content of the manuscript. It's important that the research is based on sound methodology, accurate data analysis, and valid conclusions.</p> <p>The sufficiency and recency of references depend on the current state of research in the field. References should primarily include recent and relevant sources that contribute to the context and foundation of the research. If needed, adding more recent references can enhance the manuscript's credibility.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article are important for effective scholarly communication. The manuscript should be well-written, clear, and free from grammatical errors to ensure the message is conveyed accurately.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Ensure that the introduction clearly establishes the research gap and the significance of the study. Methodology should be thorough and replicable, allowing other researchers to verify the findings. Results and discussion should be logically organized and focused on addressing the research question. Conclusions should directly answer the research question and discuss the broader implications of the findings.</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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sandip Patil
Department, University & Country	Shenzhen Children's Hospital, China