Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**Journal of Advances in Microbiology**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JAMB_124543**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Phenotypic and genotypic detection of extended-spectrum β-lactamase producing and fluoroquinolone resistant Escherichia coli isolated from Pigs and its antibiogram pattern**
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)*
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.	**This article addresses an important subject on development and transmission of AMR bacterial strains.** **AMR in food animals constitute potential source of transmission to humans giving rise to 'super bugs'**	
Is the title of the article suitable? **(If not please suggest an alternative title)**	**Suggestion:** **Antibiogram, phenotypic and genotypic detection of extended-spectrum β-lactamase producing and fluoroquinolone resistant Escherichia coli isolated from Pigs**	
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.	**Quite precise** **However, abbreviations should not appear in this section**	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	**Phrases should appear in full with abbreviations in the brackets at first mention and thereafter as abbreviations of acronyms.** **Materials and methods** **The flow should be 2.4 Antibiotic susceptibility testing 2.5 phenotypic detection of ESBLs production and FQ resistance 2.6 Genotypic detection of AMR genes (The table should appear under this subsection)** **Fig. 4 appears to have some contamination. I wish there was a better one.**	
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 article is good but does not have a discussion** **There is need to maintain consistency in gen nomenclature e.g.** *bla*$_{SHV}$, *bla*$_{CTX-M}$, *bla*$_{TEM}$	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. **-**	Sufficient	
Minor REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	Its acceptable	
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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Kenneth Waititu**
Department, University & Country	**Institute of Primate Research, Kenya**