Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**Journal of Advances in Microbiology**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JAMB_122365**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Biochemical Characteristics of Bacterial Isolates obtained from Bovine Mastitic Milk Samples**
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	**Reviewer's comment (comments word file attached)**	**Author's Feedback** *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
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.	**The study tells about the prevalence of different bacterial isolates from milk samples. But i do not like this study as solely based on the biochemical characters we cannot confirm the particular species of bacteria, further molecular detection should be done. Moreover, many biochemical tests are wrongly mentioned for different bacteria, so results could not be considered valid.**	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	**Yes, suitable**	
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.	**It should highlight importance of study in introduction and conclusion**	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	**The section namely" Isolation of mastitis causing bacteria from milk:" is additional, not particularly related to study or written by mistake Discussion is not numbered**	
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.	**No, even some of the references are wrongly mentioned**	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	No, grammar and language lack understanding at various parts in the study. Some lines are also incomplete	
Optional/General comments	Comments Comment I: The entire manuscript should be checked for proper sentence framing, grammer and plagiarism check before any decision by the journal. It should be formatted properly anf figures and tables should be adjusted appropriately. Page 2: Introduction: Among 20,000 clinical mastitis cases in the Netherlands, 40 % were caused by Streptococcus uberis and S. dysagalactiae, 30 % by Staphylococcus aureus and 30 % by Escherichia coli[3,4]. Comment II: Provide data supporting you statement with respect to the area or country where study was carried out or go through global meta-analysis rather than one study in other country randomly Page 2: Introduction: Streptococcus agalactiae is the most common Gram positive bacterium from clinical mastitis, followed by Staphylococcus aureus Comment III: S. aureus is the leading cause of mastitis among gram positive bacterium The citation 6 provided for this context by author does not support Streptococcus agalactiae as most common cause. I have provided some recent of the references related to it, please go through the data and meta-analysis more aggressively. Line 22-24 are copied directly from citation 5 provided by the author. Moreover in the study, isolates were isolated from CMT positive milk, which is gold standard for sub clinical mastitis, so references should be selected accordingly after clearing the nature of samples. Mora-Hernández, Y., Vera, M. E., Stinenbosch, J., Jauregui, H., van Dijl J. M. & Buist, G. (2021). Molecular typing and antimicrobial resistance profiling of 33 mastitis-related Staphylococcus aureus isolates from cows in the Comarca Lagunera region of Mexico. Scientific Reports, 11, 6912. Chen, C., Sun, C., Li, J., Ji, X.,Wang, Y., Song, C. & Wang, G. (2021). Characterisation of Staphylococcus aureus isolates from bovine mastitis in Ningxia, Western China. Journal of Global Antimicrobial Resistance, 25, 232-237. Hoque, M. N., Das, Z. C., Rahman, A., Haider, M. G., & Islam, M. A. (2018). Molecular characterization of Staphylococcus aureus strains in bovine mastitis milk in Bangladesh. International Journal of Veterinary Science and Medicine, 6(1), 53–60. Girmay, W., Gugsa, G., Taddele, H., Tsegaye, Y., Awol, N., Ahmed, M. & Feleke, A. (2020). Isolation and Identification of Methicillin-Resistant Staphylococcus aureus (MRSA) from Milk in Shire Dairy Farms, Tigray, Ethiopia. Veterinary Medicine International, 2020, 8833973. National Action Plan on Antimicrobial Resistance (NAP-AMR), India. (2017–2021). [Internet] http://www.searo.who.int/india/topics/antimicrobial_resistance/nap_amr.pdf . Page 2: Introduction: The bacteria causing bovine mastitis having public health importance causing intoxication or infection in human beingsare Staphylococcus aureus, Streptococcus pyogenes, Escherichia coli, Klebsiella pneumonia[7,8]. Comment IV: The sentence should be reframed to The bacteria causing bovine mastitis have public health importance causing intoxication or infection in human beings. These bacteria include Staphylococcus aureus, Streptococcus pyogenes, Escherichia coli and Klebsiella pneumonia[7,8]. Page 2: Introduction: Comment V: The introduction lacks a concluding remark about the plan and mandate of the study. Page 7: Out of 40 Gram positive cocci, 22 were streptococci due to cocci in chains, both oxidase & catalase negative and had fermentative characteristics while another 18 isolates of cocci in bunches were staphylococci as they showed oxidase positive, catalase negative, both oxidative and fermentative properties. Gram negative short rods with oxidase negative, catalase positive, only fermentative with gas production placed them under Genus Escherichia or Enterobacter; similarly acid butt, alkaline slant with H2S production may be genus Salmonella.	

	Comment VI: Staphylococci are oxidase negative and catalase positive, where as gram negative rods under Genus Escherichia or Enterobacter are oxidase positive and catalase negative. Comment VII : Figure 2 is not labelled correctly Comment VIII: Discussion is not discussed properly. The reasons for variability, similarity and importance of results are not discussed. It is better to provide comparison of results to the previous study carried out in same area or country to signify the trends of the related study. Comment IX: article is not concluded properly. Only results are mentioned. It should be about outcome and how the study is beneficial to scientific community.	

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Jasleen Kaur**
Department, University & Country	**Lala Lajpat Rai University of Veterinary and Animal Sciences, India**