

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Applied Life Sciences International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JALSI_121780
Title of the Manuscript:	Plasmid Profiles of Antibiotic Resistant Bacteria Associated with Biofilms from Ground Water Sources in Ado-Ekiti, Ekiti State, Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original 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

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	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)
<p>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.</p>	<p>The research findings are important as it provides insights into the mechanisms of antibiotic resistance in environmental settings. Groundwater is a key source of drinking water, and the presence of resistant bacteria poses a significant public health risk. Understanding the plasmid profiles can help in tracing the spread of resistance genes and inform strategies to mitigate the impact of resistant pathogens on human health. This research also contributes to the global effort to combat antimicrobial resistance, a critical issue in public health.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The manuscript title is fine.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>Overall, the findings have been well documented in this section, but there is need to improve sentence structure particularly in abstract section. There are grammatical errors as well.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes, the subsections and overall structure of the manuscript are well-organized and logically presented, allowing for a clear and coherent flow of information throughout the study.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript effectively presents the study's findings, particularly highlighting the plasmid profiles of resistant bacterial species. This information is crucial for tracking the presence and spread of resistance genes within bacterial populations.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>In discussion section, the results of this study should be compared with the studies conducted in recent 4-5 years.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>There are some syntax errors and typo mistakes which need correction</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript is found acceptable for publication after minor revision. Following points need to addressed before acceptance;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- Some more information on plasmid profiles of previously identified bacterial species from water sources should be added in introduction section. 2- In result and discussion section, error bars should be indicated in graphs. 3- References cited in discussion are old. Better to compare it with studies conducted in last 4-5 years. <p>The conclusion should be more specific.</p>	

Review Form 3

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:	Muhammad Adnan Sabir Mughal
Department, University & Country	Pakistan