

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_112331
Title of the Manuscript:	Detection of Shiga-toxin producing <i>Escherichia coli</i> from fecal samples of some cattle farms from Egypt
Type of the Article	

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. Yes, the manuscript is important for scientific community. All strains of STEC are pathogenic in humans and capable of causing less diarrhea. Depending on the presence of certain STEC subtypes and the presence/absence of the <i>eae</i> gene, all STEC subtypes can be associated with serious clinical conditions, such as hemolytic uremic syndrome, bloody diarrhea, renal failure, hospitalizations, and deaths.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title is suitable for the manuscript. However, I would suggest a few modifications, giving a final title of Detection of Shiga-toxin-producing <i>Escherichia coli</i> from fecal samples of cattle farms in Egypt.</p> <p>3. I would remove the following words: objective, study design, results, and conclusions (the abstract should be a single text, without interruption).</p> <p>4. The statistical analysis is missing. The subsections and structure are appropriate.</p> <p>5. Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct. In the introduction, I suggest inserting the last paragraph ("One of the greatest problems that affect...") at the beginning so that the first paragraph would be about antimicrobial resistance. Then, the authors could tail to the importance of <i>E. coli</i>, etc. The big picture here is antimicrobial resistance, so it should come first in the introduction.</p> <p>6. References are okay, but some scientific bacteria names are not italicized. I suggest adding the following references: -Long-Term Survival of Shiga Toxin-Producing <i>Escherichia coli</i> O26, O111, and O157 in Bovine Feces -Prevalence of Shiga Toxin-Producing <i>Escherichia coli</i> in Beef Cattle</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>There are some misspellings. Some scientific bacteria names need to be italicized. Some prepositions are misused or need to be included. I suggest improving the grammar.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Debora Brito Goulart</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>National Animal Disease Center, United States</b>