

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Pathogen Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPR_110592
Title of the Manuscript:	Campylobacter species: New insight, clinical diagnosis and laboratory approach in Nigeria
Type of the Article	Review Article

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. This is an interesting study and I think that the data are informative about the Campylobacter spp. The relatively small data collected in writing this manuscript (for this kind of data) is a weak point. I have some concerns and suggestions for each aspect of the manuscript.</p> <p>2. Title: not attractive and need more details</p> <p>3. The abstract is not comprehensive.</p> <p>4. To somewhat</p> <p>5. Yes</p> <p>6. There is shortage in references (number and updates)</p> <p>The writing could be more condensed and at times may benefit from a check by a native speaker. -all manuscript’s figures need to add legends and comments under the photos The references need to be updated and increased them</p>	<p>1. Data collection has been improved on in the revised manuscript.</p> <p>2. Title has been edited in revised manuscript.</p> <p>3. Abstract has been revisited in the revised manuscript.</p> <p>6.References have been updated in revised manuscript.</p> <p>Corrections effected in the revised manuscript.</p> <p>References have been updated and increased in the revised manuscript.</p>
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>To somewhat ..needs more revisions</p>	<p>Revision has been carried out.</p>
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>While the authors emphasized the importance of development, the study does not include longitudinal data, which limits the findings.</p>	<p>Update on longitudinal data has been added in the revised manuscript.</p>

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)	