



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	2013_BMRJ_4896
Title of the Manuscript:	Multiple Antimicrobial Resistance in Vibrio sp isolated from River and Aquaculture Water Sources in Imo State, Nigeria
Type of the Article	Research Paper

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:
(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 7 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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 subject is both timely and interesting. The work is correctly performed but there is a lack of information in the results section: - geographical information is just mentioned in the abstract; it would be helpful for readers a brief description of the sample collection region. Were the river and aquaculture collection sites in the same basin? Were the river collection sites upstream or downstream of the aquaculture sites? -the results should include some references or tables on MICs or inhibition zones. MIC50 or MIC90 values are better than %resistance. - some PCR assays (line 184) and plasmid curing assays (line 191) are mentioned but it is not clear if these refer to the authors results or to some of the referenced works; if they refer to the authors results the experiments should be explained in the methods section, and the results explained properly. The manuscript needs a writing revision because at several points it is not clear when the authors are talking about resistance rates, about resistance level (i.e. MIC or inhibition zones) or about number of resistances in a single strain; see for example: line 109, what does it mean that the "isolates expressed high resistances"? Again in lines 115-117. Then in line 139, what does it mean that resistance to kanamycin was moderate? The frequency of resistance was low or the MICs were low? It is clear from the figures that they refer to resistance rates, but this confusing terminology appears throughout the text and makes reading difficult.	
Minor REVISION comments	Figures 4 and 5 should show both numbers and percentages or a table showing both should be included.	
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jesús Mingorance
Department, University & Country	Hospital Universitario La Paz, Madrid, Spain