## Review Form 1.6

| | |
|---|---|
| Journal Name: | **International Journal of Pathogen Research** |
| Manuscript Number: | **Ms_IJPR_87950** |
| Title of the Manuscript: | **Prevalent rates of Escherichia coli O157: H7 and non-O157 strains in isolates from some selected sites in Port Harcourt, Nigeria** |
| 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.journalijpr.com/index.php/IJPR/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 | | |
| **Minor** (to major) REVISION comments | Change the first word in the titer from Prevalent to Prevalence<br>The introduction chapter might need to be restructured. In my opinion, it should start with the general information about E. coli and end with the purpose of the present study (see suggestions on the manuscript)<br>The age groups should be better defined in the text, correlated with the information with that in the table.<br>Under 2.4.2. there should be a mention that informed consent has been obtained and a questionnaire was required to be filled in (this is my deduction, as, under Results and discussions, there are several references to information with respect to hygiene and food cooking habits, or to the slaughtering process. All this information might be synthesized in a table.<br>The section Results and discussions should be better structured. Either present first all the results and then perform discussions, or do both results and discussions, but by assessing each of the samples, one by one. Discussing about meat, then clinical samples, then returning to meat and waste water, then again to patients is very difficult to follow. Also try to avoid repeats.<br>Reformulate the conclusion. | |
| **Optional/General** comments | The isolation protocole of the E. coli strains that was used seemed to me rather strange / unusual / complicated. | |

**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: | **Năşcuţiu Alexandra-Maria** |
| Department, University & Country | **"Carol Davila" University of Medicine and Pharmacy, Romania** |