



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	2013_BMRJ_5622
Title of the Manuscript:	Community-acquired CTX-M β -lactamase enteric isolates in Abeokuta, Nigeria.
Type of the 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	This manuscript reported that the prevalence of CTX-M beta-lactamase isolates in a specific area, Abeokuta, Nigeria. This manuscript contains useful information about the severity of emergence of beta-lactam antibiotic-resistant bacteria in relatively unhygienic area, particularly in Nigeria. Any reports about this area would be unique and useful in understanding the emergence of such bacteria. To strengthen this manuscript, however, authors need to provide more compelling reasons why CTX-M is particularly of interest among other genes. For instance, the local region use specific antibiotics substantially? etc.. One more suggestion is that authors should describe how they isolate such bacteria as E. coli, K. oxytoca.. etc in Table 1. This reviewer cannot locate the method.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	P1, L40, using "thus" doesn't make sense to me. Please rephrase it. P2, L44 change 'taking' to 'taken' P2, L52 change 'was' P2, l57, each isolates to each isolate P2, l57, please use only once for 'according to' P2, 65, grammatically wrong P3, 103 – 104, what is SCS, CRA, and CRT? P4, 119, klebsiella should be Klebsiella P4, 130, resistant to resistance P6, 176, remove 'a'	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	P7, 186 resistant to resistance P7, 189, resistance to resistant	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	In the conclusion section, what kind of “adequate detection” do the authors refer to?	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sung-Kun Kim
Department, University & Country	Chemistry and Biochemistry, Baylor University, USA