

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_127703
Title of the Manuscript:	Antimicrobial Susceptibility Profile Of Bacteria Isolated From Raw Sewage At A Wastewater Treatment Plant In Rio De Janeiro
Type of the Article	Original Research 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: 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. 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 could better reflect the study's novelty and key findings by highlighting unique contributions rather than reiterating general knowledge about antimicrobial resistance in wastewater.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">The study highlights the role of sewage treatment plants in antimicrobial resistance, but this topic is well-documented. The manuscript would benefit from emphasizing unique findings, such as rare bacterial isolates or novel resistance mechanisms observed.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Some references appear incomplete or formatted inconsistently, which affects credibility. Correctly formatting citations and ensuring accurate reference information is essential.	

Review Form 3

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Minor issues with sentence structure and grammar, such as overly complex sentences, detract from the manuscript's readability. For example, "Contact of these microorganisms with the community may cause not only public health problems, but also environmental impacts..." could be simplified for clarity.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While figures and tables are used effectively, some are overly detailed (e.g., antimicrobial resistance profiles) and could be summarized to enhance readability. • Limited Sample Size: With only 38 strains isolated, the dataset may not be robust enough to draw generalized conclusions about resistance patterns in the region. • No Resistance Mechanism Details: While antimicrobial susceptibility is tested, the specific resistance genes or molecular mechanisms (e.g., ESBL, carbapenemase production) are not explored, which limits the depth of analysis. • Focus on Beta-Lactams: Although beta-lactam resistance is important, other classes like macrolides or tetracyclines, which are also widely used, are omitted. This narrows the scope of antimicrobial resistance assessment. • Incomplete Biochemical Identification: While PCR was used for unidentifiable isolates, the reliance on biochemical tests may result in misidentification, particularly for organisms with atypical profiles. • Single Method for Sensitivity Testing: The agar diffusion method, though standard, might not detect subtle resistance mechanisms like intermediate resistance levels or low-level resistance that could be detected by broth microdilution or E-tests. • Lack of Environmental Factors: The manuscript does not discuss the potential role of environmental factors (e.g., temperature, pH, sewage composition) in shaping the resistance profile of isolates. • No Molecular Confirmation: Molecular analysis of antimicrobial resistance genes (ARGs) could enhance the robustness of the findings. For example, PCR targeting genes like <i>bla</i>, <i>mecA</i>, or <i>van</i> would add significant value. 	

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>Aqeel Ismael Gheni</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Koya University, Iraq</p>