

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_86034
Title of the Manuscript:	Rotavirus in Oysters, Lettuce, and feces in Children with diarrhea from Panama
Type of the Article	Short communication

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.journaljamb.com/index.php/JAMB/editorial-policy>)

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	The manuscript is a preliminary work characterizing the distribution of rotavirus serotypes among children and on food. This preliminary study has highlighted the need for deeper surveillance of enteric viruses in aquatic environments and the link with contamination in bivalves and vegetables in Panama. Our findings reveal the need for public intervention in the use of river water as a source of irrigation for vegetables. As well as the development of a sanitary surveillance control on the consumption of bivalve mollusks that are consumed raw, as well as, lightly cooked in Panama. In this context, the immunogenicity and efficacy of rotavirus vaccines may be challenged by the evolution of the rotavirus viral genome.	According to your comment, the investigation emphasized those points.
Minor REVISION comments	The manuscript is a preliminary work characterizing the distribution of rotavirus serotypes among children and on food products and is for informational purposes only.	It is a preliminary investigation
Optional/General comments	The article can be published as an epidemiological characterization of the prevalence of rotavirus serotypes in Panama. Does not contain statistical analysis and the section "Discussion of the results".	No statistical studies were done.

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)	