SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

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**

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	**Authors' response to final evaluator's comments**
The text improved lots since its first version, however it still needs further revisions. The old line R64, now line 42 "Other strains of E. coli that cause gastroenteritis in human include:…EHEC" needs to be modified again because, as said last time, E. coli 0157:H7 is belonging to the group of EHEC. An idea on how to modify it could be something like this: " *E. coli 0157:H7 is a serotype belonging to the group of enterohemorrhagic E. coli (EHEC), while other strains of E. coli that cause gastroenteritis in humans include: enteroaggregative (EAEC), enteroinvasive (EIEC), enteropathogenic (EPEC), enterotoxigenic (ETEC) and diffuse adherent (DAEC) [3].*" L13-14 : "fourteen (14)" this is not necessary delete one of the two. Would instead be nice to have the abbreviation of the hospital ABUTH after its first appearance in the article L11. L49: Write again the full name of the hospital, as it is the first time that it appears in the main text, with its acronyms in parenthesis and further on, all over the text, use only the acronyms ABUTH, please. This is valid for all the acronyms used along the text. L60: "eosin methylen blue" *agar* (to add?)	

L64: Further biochemical test for *E. coli* *such as* (to add?) …

L72-75: Are these methods been utilized on the samples of this study? If not, as I believe, these lines need to be deleted. "Methods should describe the tests used and their sequence as to give to someone else the opportunity to repeat the experiment".

Results and discussions are still very difficult to read. I would advice to simplify the text reporting only relevant matter. In my opinion would be easily readable in this way:

> L88-91: delete as this is not a result of your study. You can delete this sentence or utilize it in the introduction or to bound discussions but I don't advice to use it for opening the result section.
>
> L 95: you can add here: *by morphological, phenotypical and biochemical tests (Figure 1).*
>
> L103-114 (text): delete. I would eliminate as it is not the aim of this article to describe how to run routine bacteriological tests. Bacteriologist are supposed to know it and all the others, I believe, are not interested in it.
>
> L115-116: can be used as key for the Figure 1 (which is described instead as "Figure2" L110: please modify).
>
> Figure 1: …*and on EMB agar* (to add?)
>
> Table 2 (described as another Table1): see L 103-104. Plus it does not add any relevant information to the text or to table 1. It is not necessary to the reader to know which *E. coli* among the samples was positive for CT-SMA. Table 1 briefly and better summarize the information in Table 2.
>
> L157-176: Those data are very interesting but are not discussion of the results of this study, neither, as they appear in the text have been related to the study results. They should be modified or deleted. In any case I would not interrupt the study results which continue in L 177.

Figure 3: modify as Figure 2. L188: "*S = Sensitive, I = Intermediate, R= Resistance"* please delete as in the figure do not appear any S, I or R. Figure 4: modify as Figure 3. L204-205: This title in the middle of the results is not necessary. Delete it, please. Table 3: please check the data in it (e.g.: s46 and n°of antibiotic) L206-218: unclear…Probably the author wish to say: *"According with the definitions of Multidrug-resistant (MDR) and Extensively drug resistant (XDR) of the International Expert Proposal for Interim Standard Definitions for acquired resistance, where MDR are bacteria non susceptible to ≥1 agent in ≥3 antimicrobial categories and XDR non-susceptible to at least one agent in all except one or two categories [41], the resistance pattern of the isolates showed that 54.5%(n=6) of the isolates were MDR and 18.2% (n=2) showed XDR (Figure 4). ?* Please make sure that the data are correct (see table 3). L220-226: In order to improve discussion would be nice to compare the data of other studies, like the ones in these lines, with the results of this study.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Valeria Mariano**
Department, University & Country	**Laboratory of diagnostic, IZSLT, Italy**