



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJTDH_12715
Title of the Manuscript:	Pattern of Antimicrobial Resistance of Escherichia coli from Healthy Adults in Amassoma, South-South 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:

(<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	1. The author need not to use conclusive languages because the work has not shown the presence of this extended spectrum beta lactamase genes nor the mode of resistant to antibiotics in the isolates 2. The level of resistance expressed by the isolate to some antibiotic as stated in authors abstract those not correlate with the Result/discussion	1. The corrected are noted and have been effected in the manuscript. There are indicated in yellow ink as instructed. 2. This also has been corrected and effected.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. The author should differentiate between the result and discussion. Tables and figures should be self explanatory. 2. What is the multiantibiotic resistance index of the isolates	1. The notes in the result column have been drastically reduced to point only to the tables (which are self explanatory) without adding any other explanation. 2. Multi antibiotic resistance index (MARI) which measures the multiple resistance level of each isolate to all the agents tested irrespective of the agents' classes has been superseded by the measure of multiple antibiotic resistance calculated on the basis of the classes of all the agents used as described by Magiorakos <i>et al</i>, 2011. This is the reason why MARI is not calculated for these isolates and it is not used to measure the level of multiple resistance in this study.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I suggest molecular characterization of ESBL in the isolates should be carried out. Specifically OXA, SHV, TEM, some intr etc Plasmid analysis of the isolates to identify the site of the resistant genes. Please clarify the ethical issue, if any	1. The detection of ESBL was not determined in the isolates because it is out of the scope of the work as at that time. We will however incorporate that and other important analysis in our further studies. 2. The faculty of Pharmacy of the University where the study was conducted gave ethical approval on the study since it pertained to the use of human specimen. The emphasis was on the voluntary participation of the subjects which we ensured. All the participating volunteers gave INFORMED CONSENT of their willingness to participate in the study. They gave demographic data which did not include names and addresses, and they were free not to participate if they so wish without any consequences. As at the time of the study, there was no constituted ethical committee which the university is setting up now (being a young university) because of the demand from study like this. Hence, no number was given but the study was conducted in line with international guidelines on studies involving human subjects.
---	---	---