

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Parasitology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJP_126050
Title of the Manuscript:	Detection of QnrS genes in E. coli from Clinical isolates in Bayelsa State.
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Yes, it is important to the scientific community, but some corrections are needed in the manuscript.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	I think it's appropriate as a title.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The abstract is comprehensive, but it could be streamlined for clarity. Break up lengthy sentences, like the one describing quinolone resistance mechanisms, to improve readability. The study objective is somewhat vague. Consider rephrasing to explicitly outline the research question and methodology used. 	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	I think the structure of the manuscript and the subsections are appropriate.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The background on <i>E. coli</i> and quinolone resistance is informative; however, the discussion could benefit from clearer segmentation to separate general information from study-specific details. For example, the description of resistance mechanisms and the significance of plasmid-mediated quinolone resistance could be in distinct paragraphs. Define key terms (e.g., "plasmid-mediated quinolone resistance") for readers who may not be familiar with the field. The methodology section provides detailed steps but could be improved by clarifying why certain methods, like API 20E, were chosen over others. Consider adding brief rationales for each antibiotic tested in the susceptibility analysis to contextualize their selection and relevance in clinical settings. Ethical considerations are addressed, but it would be helpful to specify how consent was obtained from patients. Tables and figures are included, but clearer labeling and standardized formatting would improve readability. Ensure all tables have consistent fonts, headings, and statistical symbols (e.g., %). Add subheadings within the results section to distinguish among the various analyses (e.g., bacterial isolation rates, age distribution, susceptibility test results). 	

Review Form 3

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The discussion covers relevant findings, yet lacks depth in comparing this study's results to other similar studies. Consider expanding on comparisons, particularly with studies cited, to highlight any unique findings or support existing literature. Strengthen the interpretation of the results with implications for clinical practice. For instance, discuss how findings on qnrS gene prevalence might inform antibiotic prescription practices. The discussion on limitations is minimal. Mention potential sources of bias, such as sample size and site-specific factors, which may limit the generalizability of the findings. The conclusion reiterates findings but lacks actionable recommendations. Provide specific suggestions for future studies or practical applications based on the study results. 	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>-</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The references are mostly relevant but should follow a consistent citation format (e.g., italicizing journal titles, standardizing authorship format). Ensure that recent studies on quinolone resistance are included to keep the reference list up-to-date and align with recent developments in resistance mechanisms and detection methods. 	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Throughout the manuscript, there are minor grammatical issues and typographical errors (e.g., "qnrS gene were detected"). Proofreading the text to correct these will enhance readability and professionalism. Avoid informal phrases like "this study reveals." Instead, use more precise language, such as "the results indicate." 	
<u>Optional/General</u> 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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Aqeel Ismael Gheni
Department, University & Country	Koya University, Iraq