

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>

Review Form 3

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, this manuscript has the precise and specific of systematic study and important for scientific community. I like this manuscript because author explained deeply about different quinolone resistant genes and explained to molecular level of QnrS genes in the <i>E.coli</i> isolates. So the bangs of antibiotic resistance were explained.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, it is suitable title. No need change to new one.	
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.	Yes, Comprehensive. Note: Author got 18 <i>Klebsiella sp</i> isolates also. If the author use these isolates to detect the QnrS genes for resistance study means the manuscript is more comprehensive.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, this manuscript contains subsections and proper structure in appropriate level.	
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.	This original manuscript is scientifically correct. Because this will explain early diagnosis and modification of quinolone with a wider spectrum of activity and improve the treatment, in which the impact of antibiotic resistance were explained.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Yes, the references are sufficient and recent. 1. In the text reference, reference number 4 and 13 were missing. 2. In the reference section, references were not serial numbered. Then how will check the text references.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1. Yes, it is suitable for scholarly communications. 2. Some sentences need proper sentence formation.	
Optional/General comments	Nil	

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:	Magesh Sachidanandam
Department, University & Country	King Institute of Preventive Medicine and Research, India