

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Research in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJRM_123524
Title of the Manuscript:	Occurrence and distribution of antibiotic resistant bacterial genes in agricultural lands of Japan, Indonesia and Philippines
Type of the Article	Short 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>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	AMR has been a prevalent global concern and always warrants latest scientific information and research in order to combat it efficiently. The current manuscript adheres to it.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is 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.	The abstract of the article is comprehensive	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	I request authors to add more textual literature in the sections of Introduction and Results and Discussion	
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.	The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are sufficient and recent	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Grammatical errors should be rectified	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tijo Cherian
Department, University & Country	Pondicherry University, India