



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Microbiology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_50783
Title of the Manuscript:	ESBL Mediated Antimicrobial Nonsusceptibility of Uropathogenic Escherichia coli and Klebsiella pneumoniae Isolates from Pregnant Women in Nnewi, 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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p>	<p>In the abstract the abbreviations "UTI" and "PCR" should have the full name upon first mention. This also applies for the main text. Also UTI refers to the singular, while UTIs should be used as plural</p> <p>In the Introduction "capable of hydrolyzing diverse spectra of <math>\beta</math>-lactams" should be changed to "capable of hydrolyzing a diverse spectrum of <math>\beta</math>-lactams"</p> <p>The phrase "because it is minutely affected by production of high-level AmpC" should read "because it is minimally affected by the production of high-levels of AmpC"</p> <p>In Methods, the sentence "The electrophoretic products were viewed with ultraviolet trans-illuminator" should read "The electrophoretic products were viewed with an ultraviolet trans-illuminator"</p> <p>The phrases "initial denaturation was set at 94oC for 3 minutes of 35 cycles" and "final extension was set at 72oC for 2 minutes of 35 cycles" are not "of 35 cycles" but just once so it should be removed</p> <p>The Methods say "Two hundred and fifteen urine samples were obtained from pregnant women on ante natal care." but the Results say "the urine of the one hundred and seventy-five pregnant women subjected to the study". Which one is correct?</p> <p>The phrase "were observed to harbor AmpC gene together with ESBL (tables 3 and 4)." should read "were observed to harbor the AmpC gene together with ESBL (Tables 3 and 4)."</p> <p>The phrase "It was observed that almost all the isolates harbored varying number of plasmids" should read "It was observed that almost all the isolates harbored varying numbers of plasmids"</p> <p>In Figures 4 and 5, the marker band sizes should be indicated on the figure at least for key sizes. It is impossible to understand the plasmid size range</p> <p>The phrase "leading to increased mortality and morbidity" should read "leading to increased morbidity and mortality"</p> <p>The phrase "ESBL resistance determinants during conjugations studies" should read "ESBL resistance determinants during conjugation studies"</p> <p>Sentences starting with "Majority of" should be changed to "The majority of"</p> <p>The phrase "A great deal of epidemiological studies is recommended" should read "A great deal of epidemiological studies are recommended"</p> <p>The phrase "There are socio and economic burden" should read "There are socio and economic burdens"</p>	<p>Corrected!</p> <p>Corrected!</p> <p>Corrected!</p> <p>Corrected!</p> <p>Corrected!</p> <p>Its an oversight. The correct figure is 215!</p> <p>Corrected!</p> <p>Corrected!</p> <p>The band sizes have been indicated</p> <p>Corrected</p> <p>Corrected</p> <p>Corrected</p> <p>Corrected</p> <p>Corrected</p> <p>Corrected</p>
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p>		



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	There were no ethical issues