



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 topic of the article is actual and very interesting although it needs major revisions. R64: Other strains... E. coli 0157:H7 is an EHEC, please review the paragraph. R76: E. coli are serotyped by antigene profiles. The selective isolation of presuntive E. coli 0157:H7 in clinical samples is commonly done by biochemical tests but a serological and/or genetic confirmation is needed, as stated also in lines 78-79 and well explained in the methods of a similar article found in the references list such as http://www.ajol.info/index.php/ajb/article/view/78258/68629. As I saw in the reference list an EPA document of 2012, probably could be useful also to read the Standard Analytical Protocol for Escherichia coli O157:H7 in Water (Particularly paragraph 10.5) available at: http://cfpub.epa.gov/si/si_public_record_report.cfm?address=nhsrsrc/&dirEntryId=224124 R78-79: unclear... Methodology and Results need to be revised. I strongly advice to follow the brief guidelines for authors to correct the document (available at: http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=general-guideline-for-authors) and probably the reference listed	1. Rb4 has been reviewed 2. This study as the topic states uses the conventional method of identifying E. coli 0157:H7 to evaluate their antibiotic susceptibility profile. 3. This method used is as contained in most microbiological test book. 4. Reference: the Journal style of referencing have been employed.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	above could be useful. The method used to isolate and identificate E. coli 0157:H7 is not clear, even if it can be presumed from Table 1. Methods should describe the tests used and their sequence as to give to someone else the opportunity to repeat the experiment. Furthermore it is not clear if any serotyping has been done on the isolates. Explanation and discussion on the specificity of the tests conducted are needed. Results need to be described and all Tables and Figures should be mentioned in parentheses in the text. Discussion about Figures/Tables should be reported before the Figures/Tables whose title should be brief. References need to respect the journal style.	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	English need to be revised particularly on lines: R 13-16; R 24-26; R 33-36... R8: globally is not necessary R42-44: To facilitate the reading the author could move this sentence before or after, so to keep the food-borne infections altogether. Table 2 is a good summary of Table 1, which is not necessary. If the author, anyhow wish to leave Table 1 its key need to report all the acronyms used, preferably in order of comparison in the Table. Table 3 and 4, as well, are not necessary as Figure 3 and 4 better summarize the results. Figure 3 needs to be modified in order to be readable. The first part of Discussion can be used in the Results section.	R 13-16; R 24-26; R 33-36... have been reviewed. The wish to leave Table 2 and Table 1. All other correction have noted and corrections have been effected.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		