



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJTDH_13112
Title of the Manuscript:	CONVENTIONAL IDENTIFICATION AND ANTIBIOGRAM OF E. coli SEROTYPE 0157:H7 IN ABUTH ZARIA
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	The authors made a poor presentation of results. In the subtitle of results, the figures and tables appear without explanation or interconnection between them. This assumes that the reader has to imagine why these results are presented in this way. I think that (suggest) that the results and discussion can be presented with the subtitle "results and discussion", and finally another subtitle for conclusions. The authors can re-organize the results. It is necessary that from the beginning of the results, the reader can identify the samples designated as S, U and B (isolated from feces, urine and blood, respectively). Figure 1. In the caption of Figure 1, indicating that the image on the left-side corresponds to growth in agar eosin-methylene blue, and at right-side to growth in MacConkey agar. Table 1. The No. lab for strains seems totally disorganized, the U₇ and S₅₆ strains observed in the Figure 1 do not appear in this table, raises the question if all samples really are showing in this table. Table 1. This table is not very informative, these results can be described as text. Table 2. Delete the S/N column because it makes no	The discussions and the results have been connected/linked. Figure 1 the image on the left-side corresponds to growth in agar eosin-methylene blue, and at right-side to growth in Sorbitol MacConkey agar Table 1. there is actually a mistake the labeling should have been the reverses. U7 is the negative while S56 is the colourless E. coli O157:H7. Table 2: S/N has been deleted. Figure 2: has been deleted. Table 4: Correction pointed in table 4 has been effected Resent work (2014-2015) on E. coli O157 in Zaria is still inconclusive. The student is still on the bench work.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	contribution. Figure 2. The results shown in Figure 2 may be described in a text without having to make a figure to it. Table 4. The results shown in Table 4 are shown in Table 3. Include in the Table 3, two groups or a column indicates the strains O₁₅: H₇. Finally, data were obtained in 2011, to date (2014) may have changed this situation (results of the 2011). Are there local or neighbor works?.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Line 14. Placing space in "6months". Here and rest of the text. Line 19. Delete "(Figure 3)" Line 21. Change "(SAM), amoxicillin-..." by "(SAM) and amoxicillin-..." Line 69. Change "... (EIEC) (They....)" by "... (EIEC). They...." Line 78. Correct "...., which can only be determined by serological analysis of gene sequences..." Line 79. Write in cursive "E.coli". Line 102. Change "silva" by "Silva". Line 18. Change "MARI" by "MAR Index". Here and rest of the text.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Please clarify the ethical issue, if any	