

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_119240
Title of the Manuscript:	Isolation, Antibiotic Sensitivity Profiling, and Biocide Tolerance of <i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i> from Canine Otitis Cases
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.7

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Importance: The authors aimed to conduct a field experiment during the spring of 2023-24 to investigate the impact of different levels of nitrogen and foliar nano zinc on soil health and yield attributes of wheat. 2. Title: Preferred to be modified into "Isolation, Sensitivity, and Tolerance of <i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i> from Canine Otitis". 3. Abstract: Notice the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide an opening statement of one or two short sentences as a background on the problem. • Provide the exact number of the samples collected. • Add the P-value for the significant results. • Some modifications were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text. 4. Structure of the manuscript: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keywords: Re-arrange in alphabetical order and modify as suggested. • Introduction: Notice the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Properly displayed. ➤ Re-check the writing style of the scientific names. ➤ Abbreviate the scientific names after their first appearance. ➤ Some modifications were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text. • The aim: Some modifications were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text. • Materials and methods: Please notice the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Provide the institutional ethical approval for the study. ➤ Provide the manufacturer and source of Brain Heart Infusion agar, Muller Hinton Broth, and Muller-Hinton agar. ➤ MUST specify the total number of ear swab samples collected during the one-year study. ➤ Identify the mean used for determining the inhibition zone around the antibiotic disk. ➤ Provide the manufacturer and source of the antibiotic disks such as Piperacillin-Tazobactam -100/10µg, Aztreonam-30µg, Cefipime- 30µg, Imipenem- 10µg, Norfloxacin-10µg, Ceftazidime- 30µg, Gentamicin- 10µg, Ceftriaxone-Tazobactam- 90µg, Tobramycin-10µg, Ofloxacin- 5µg, Polymixin- B- 300IU, and Levofloxacin- 5µg. ➤ Abbreviate the scientific names after their first appearance. ➤ Provide a reference for the used software and the model used for the statistical analysis. ➤ Some modifications were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text. • Results: Notice the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Abbreviate the names of the antibiotic disks using the listed abbreviations instead of repeating their names all over. ➤ The authors mentioned in the text using ciprofloxacin and it is not listed in the materials and methods section. ➤ Do not list the P-value for the non-significant results. ➤ Re-check the writing style of the scientific names. ➤ Many modifications were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text. • Discussion: Clear to a certain extent with moderate comparisons and speculation. • Conclusion: Some modifications were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text. • Tables: Properly arranged and well organized. • Figure: Properly arranged and well organized. 5. Scientific Soundness: highlighted that Ciprofloxacin could be a better therapeutic option for treating canine otitis caused by <i>P. aeruginosa</i>. Better environmental sanitation against pathogenic <i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i> could be attained by chlorhexidine than Cetyl Trimethyl 	

Review Form 1.7

	Ammonium Bromide. 6. References: MUST BE UPDATED as 33.3% (9 out of 27) of the listed references were published in the past five years. The percentage has to increase to at least 35-40%. Old references and lack of updates indicate that the study is no longer a point of interest.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	General view: The manuscript was expressed in moderate English and grammar. Professional copyediting, proofreading, proper display of the abstract, declaring some explanations in the materials and methods section, and updating the references have to be carried out before resubmission to achieve publishing value.	
Optional/General 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:	Essam Samir Soliman
Department, University & Country	Suez Canal University, Egypt