

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_121041
Title of the Manuscript:	Screening for Resistant Genes and Plasmid Curing Profile of Salmonella enterica and Listeria monocytogenes from Seafood Sold in Rivers State, Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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)
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 manuscript is very important for the scientific community if the author makes a re-write by incorporating all the given comments. The authors can access my detailed comments from the main manuscript document. BY	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	I suggest the author change the title to; <i>Salmonella enterica</i> and <i>Listeria monocytogenes</i> from Seafood: Plasmid Curing Reagent Profiles and Drug Resistance Gene Screening, Rivers State, Nigeria	
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 is not comprehensive, the author should incorporate the study design and should write the methods and the result part precisely. For detailed information, the authors should look at my comments on the main document.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, but there is lack of coherence and information flawless in each sub section/ sub title/. For more information the authors can see the comments given in each section	
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 idea is very nice but I doubt that the authors properly flow proper laboratory procedures to find the intended result. There is unnecessary statements in the abstract and discussion part, simultaneously there is some statements missed at each sub section, I recommended the author to revise each section carefully.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, even though there are some references that are too old, I didn't see a major mistake in reference usage.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	There is grammatical and spelling errors	
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>	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Yared Abate
Department, University & Country	Livestock and fishery Research Center, Arba Minch University, Ethiopia