

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 Pseudomonas aeruginosa 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><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript touches a vital issue relevant to antimicrobials in veterinary microbiology and uncovers the mechanisms of resistance to the fierce microorganism <i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i>. The biocides are usually used by limited knowledge whether they are equally effective or not; the study provide technical evidence in a comparative format about that. The study favors antimicrobial stewardship programs in veterinary science which aim at achieving the best therapeutic outcome through the appropriate choice of antibiotic. Making this study valuable.</p> <p>2. The title is descriptive, concise, accurate and not misleading. It accurately reflects the study's content and scope.</p> <p>3. Yes, it is. It clearly states the study's purpose, the approach used for isolation and profiling, and the key findings on antibiotic sensitivity and biocide tolerance.</p> <p>4. The structure of the manuscript is appropriate and well defined. Each section logically follows the previous one, ensuring a coherent flow of information. Except for one comment the subsection 3.1 Isolation and identification of <i>Pseudomonas</i> should better follow material and methodology section OR put in separate section NOT appropriately follows results and discussion section,</p> <p>5. Yes, the manuscript is free from scientific misconducting. As well It uses established methods for isolating and identifying <i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i>, performs standard antibiogram testing, and applies a robust statistical analysis.</p> <p>6. The references are sufficient BUT 10 out of 27 references are out of date more than 10 years and NEED to be replaced by recent references consistent with the same context.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The manuscript uses scientific language, contains no conjunctions, slang, and no redundant texts. However, minor grammatical improvements could enhance readability.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. Material and Methodology Section:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Laboratory Details: It would be beneficial to specify the laboratory where the research was conducted. This information helps provide context and credibility to the study. - Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria: Providing more detailed inclusion and exclusion criteria will enhance the clarity and reproducibility of the study. - Sample Size Justification: Currently, the sample size lacks formal justification or calculation. Including a detailed explanation and calculation will strengthen the statistical analysis. - Sample Size in Results: Although the number of cases collected is mentioned in the Results and Discussion sections, incorporating sample size calculations into the methodology section would improve coherence. - Study Design: The study design is not explicitly stated. Given the nature of the research, a descriptive cross-sectional study design is suggested. This should be clearly mentioned to guide readers through the research approach. <p>2. General Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Funding Source: It would be helpful to identify who provided the funding for this study. Transparency about funding sources adds to the study's integrity. - Abbreviations: Some abbreviations, such as COMP3 and COMP7 in the Antibiogram section, are not clearly explained. Providing detailed explanations for all abbreviations will aid reader comprehension. - Generalizability: The study acknowledges its geographical limitations. It may be worthwhile to discuss the potential for broader applications or the need for further studies in different regions to enhance generalizability. <p>Suggestions for Improvement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clearly specify the laboratory and the study design in the methodology section. - Detail the inclusion and exclusion criteria and include sample size justification and calculations. - Clarify abbreviations in the manuscript to ensure they are understood by all readers. - Address the funding source transparently and discuss the broader applicability of the findings. studies to confirm findings. 	
---	---	--

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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Marwa Abdel Aziz Fergany
Department, University & Country	Tookh Central Hospital, Egypt