

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_127095
Title of the Manuscript:	ISOLATION, CHARACTERIZATION OF ANTIBIOTIC RESISTANCE BACTERIA IN SELECTED FISH POND ECOSYSTEMS IN OSUN 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

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative 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.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript 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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		
:		

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Abstract The abstract clearly states the relevance of studying antibiotic resistance in aquatic ecosystems. but</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Improve grammar: Some sentences are wordy or have grammatical issues. For example, "The finding revealed that there was a growing issue..." could be simplified to "Findings indicate a growing issue..." <p>Introduction The introduction provides a relevant background on the role of antibiotics and the issue of antibiotic resistance. It might be helpful and clearer the objective. Moreover,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The introduction mentions antibiotic-resistant bacteria but does not elaborate on the mechanisms of resistance. Including a brief explanation of how bacteria acquire and spread resistance (e.g., through horizontal gene transfer, plasmids, or mutations) would enhance the scientific rigor of the introduction. 2. The introduction mentions the need to investigate antibiotic resistance in aquaculture but does not clearly identify the gap in the existing literature. Explicitly stating what is missing from current research will strengthen the justification for the study. <p>Materials and methods Provide more detailed information on the sampling procedure.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The sampling process description is likely insufficient in explaining how samples were collected, processed, and preserved for analysis? <p>What is the exact size of fish? For instance, if no details are provided about the specific locations of the ponds, the frequency of sampling, or how the samples were handled after collection, this could hinder reproducibility.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Ensure that the bacterial isolation and identification process is thoroughly explained, specifying the duration of incubation. Specify the antibiotics used for testing and the method employed. Include concentrations, controls, and the process for interpreting results. 3. The statistical methods used to analyze the data may not be clearly outlined, explain categories variables and cross tabulation. clarify the term Descriptive statistics. Also provide information on how environmental factors were controlled or monitored. <p>Results</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The results section mentions data displayed in Figures 2, 3, and 4, but the descriptions could be enhanced by briefly summarizing the trends observed in these figures (e.g., stating whether certain bacteria consistently showed higher loads or resistance across locations). <p>Discussion</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Differentiate between statistical significance and biological relevance, particularly in cases where the effect sizes are small despite being statistically significant. 2. The discussion might overlook factors such as seasonal variations, sample size limitations, or other environmental conditions that could impact the generalizability of the findings. 3. Claims about potential health risks to humans or comparisons with WHO standards might lack supporting citations, making the arguments less credible. <p>References Please check carefully all your references according to the guidelines.</p>	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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>
<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>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Kaynat Saeed</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>University of Agriculture, Faisalabad, Pakistan</p>