

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Biotechnology and Genetic Engineering</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJBGE_123624
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Molecular Characterization of Extended-spectrum <math>\beta</math>-Lactamase Producing Escherichia coli from Suspected Cases of Diarrhea in Nasarawa South Senatorial Zone, Nigeria</b>
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

<u>Compulsory</u> 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><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The manuscript highlight the significance of the presence of the <i>bla<sub>SHV</sub></i>, <i>bla<sub>TEM</sub></i>, <i>bla<sub>CTX</sub></i> which is might be causing extend-spectrum cephalosporin resistance in E.coli. It also brings to light the contradictions between the genes that are present in the study conducted in Nigeria against other studies that have been conducted elsewhere around the world which is a cause of concern.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>The title is okay, but the author has to be consistent in the writing of the title in the content in terms of punctuation where to put or not to put commas.</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The methodology needs a bit of flesh on the procedures that we carried out all, of them must be spelt out in in brief to just show a road map of what really transpired in conducting the research and there should be consistency in terms of scientific writing of the genes throughout the paper (ie <i>bla<sub>SHV</sub></i>, <i>bla<sub>TEM</sub></i>, <i>bla<sub>CTX</sub></i>)</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>The subsections and titles are appropriate only where it was underlined there is no significant purpose of highlight that particular subtitle 2.2.1</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>There was use of scientific terminology in writing the paper and also the description of the methodology was written in a technically sound manner highlighting the processes undertaken in a sound and technical manner that is easy to follow if one wants to repeat the procedure of authentication, validation and verification of the results that were produce in the research</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<p><b>There is need to put more recent references because there is a balance of old and new references which is not really up to a good standard of scientific representation of trends that are happening as science is evolving at a very fast rate hence the need to include recent and updated information of current phenomenon.</b></p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language is satisfactory, and the quality of the paper is suitable for scholarly communication</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Kudakwashe Sylvester Kakurira</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Zimbabwe</b>