

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Food Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AFSJ_87421
Title of the Manuscript:	Determination of the Antibigram, Extended Beta-Lactamase Production, and Metallo-beta-lactamase of E. coli O157:H7 Isolated from Pigs and Periwinkles sold in Rivers State
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalafsj.com/index.php/AFSJ/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>REVIEWERS COMMENTS</p> <p>TITLE The title shows a relevant study The title can be rephrased to become shorter and made captivating. Keywords: Any work found in titles should not be repeated in keywords.</p> <p>ABSTARCT Abstract is too long. reduce to 250 words. Only present the key findings The principal reason for the analysis was captured in abstract. Also the abstract is tied to the title. I could find the objective statement (principal reason). A reader would expect a one sentence recommendation.</p> <p>INTRODUCTION To the best of our knowledge, there is paucity of information in the detection or isolation of ESBL and MBLs E. coli O157:H7 associated with pigs and periwinklesHence the study objective should capture the new thing the authors are researching on. Please add "To provide useful information" should be simplified...do you mean microbial? antibiogram? etc Rephrase the aim/objective Overall the text isnt difficult to follow but flows naturally. However a good introduction should be with recent citations at least 2. Recent citations were not observed and should be added.</p> <p>MATERIALS AND METHODS Please indicate the actual specie of periwinkle used (botanical name) Also specify the actual sample. example do you mean periwinkle edible membrane? This was replicated twenty times....why replicate 20X to obtain a representative sample. Kindly indicate/add the geographical coordinates of the sample collection points. A total of 240 samples was generated and all samplesindicate how you arrived at 240 samples....does it mean 120 samples per pork or periwinkle or feacal matter? The extracted meat was placed into steriledo you mean membrane? Pasteurized chucked periwinkles samples.....is this subtitle necessary? Because the content already captured in extraction of periwinkle. or separate properly. please separate all units and there measurment value. eg 250ml is 250 mL, 5mins is 5 min, 2% is 2 %. Half of the manuscript is made up of results and discussion.....I suggest the author reduce the length by using eg determination of metallo beta-lactamase was performed using procedures described by Fazlul et al 2019. However, if the authors wanted to keep the whole preparation procedure in full discussion, then the manuscript title should capture the word "preparation" in the title. Ten milliliters (10ml) of sterile Nutrient is unacceptable. use 10 mL or 10 milliliters 225mls of sterile change to 225 mL etc 8hrs change to 8 hr etc</p> <p>RESULTS Results of the antibiotics susceptibility test of E. coli O157: H7 isolated from various samples is presented in fig 1.....Was repeated in Results of the antibiotics susceptibility test for E. coli O157 isolated from various samples is presented in fig 1 (next paragraph) Please edit. In table 1.the sources/locations of sampling points were mentioned.....Please add the location list in materials and methods or use a map to capture all locations. Overall the text was not difficult to follow and authors detailed the validity of the approach. Sample size was sufficient and grouping Although an error evaluation would be significant Besides that, though methodology is appriprate.</p> <p>DISCUSIONS especially to drugs which they had been sensitive to....a sentence should not end with "to"rephrase</p>	<p>Thanks. The title have been adjusted as suggested.</p> <p>They represent the keywords.</p> <p>We have adjusted the abstract but if we go by reducing to 250, we would have to remove some important points required in abstract.</p> <p>Noted. This has been included. Thanks.</p> <p>Noted and corrected. Thanks.</p> <p>Thanks. This has been highlighted.</p> <p>Noted and corrected. Thanks.</p> <p>Noted and corrected. Thanks.</p> <p>These are known markets in the city. As at the time of collection, GPS coordinates were not collected. The samples size and sample allocation has been updated too. Thanks.</p> <p>Updated.</p> <p>Done. Thanks.</p> <p>Thanks for your suggestion, but the authors however feel that stating a method adopted rather than just mentioning the reference would go along way in helping scholars who intend on carrying out a similar study.</p>

Review Form 1.6

	<p>Discussion will be better understood if presented in separate paragraghs. Eg first paragragh should capture pork, next paragragh periwinkle etc. and their study findings. Overall they explanations were adequate and over interpretation were avoided. Conclusion. The authors may recommend how the think antibiotics can be regulated and not saying general statement. also conclusion should capture what further studies/modeling that predict the relationship/effects with precision and accuracy could be FIGURES AND TABLES There were no defective figures nor tables SUMMARY The Text was not difficult to follow Sufficient Statistics but no error treatment Adequate interpretation of data Results presented clearly and logically but may need to be further compared with findings The study did not fully capture the novelty which should be a progress in multi-drug resistance microbials REFERENCES The references were in order but needs to be updated to recent studies</p>	<p>Thank you very much. We have made changes as suggested. Thanks once again.</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
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)	