



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_45662
Title of the Manuscript:	Microbial Assessment of Foods and Currencies from Street Food Vendors and Antibiotic Resistance Profile of Isolates
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>In general manuscript is providing relevant information. Manuscript is written understandable way, however some corrections are needed.</p> <p>SPECIFIC COMMENTS</p> <p>ABSTRACT Line 19-21: Which antibiotics were used in this study? It should be given in Abstract section. Line 30: "E" should be "<i>Escherichia</i>".</p> <p>INTRODUCTION The introduction provided the necessary background information</p> <p>MATERIAL AND METHODS The research methodology for the study was appropriate and applied properly.</p> <p>RESULTS AND DISCUSSION Line 250 : Table 3 should be revised. It should be given like R (resistance), I (Intermediate) and S (Susceptible).</p> <p>The discussion about the antibiotic resistance part was not necessary. Antibiotic resistance at species level should be discussed.</p> <p>REFERENCES</p> <p>References were complete and appropriate.</p>	<p>ABSTRACT The antibiotics used and their concentrations are in the Material and Methods and about 52 words, which will violate specified number of words for Abstract "E" is replaced with "<i>Escherichia</i>"</p> <p>MATERIAL AND METHODS Food samples were analysed within 24 h while the currencies were done within 48 h after collection.</p> <p>RESULTS AND DISCUSSION Table 3 has been revised</p> <p>The discussion about antibiotic resistance at species level is included</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>In general manuscript is providing relevant information. Manuscript is written understandable way, however some corrections are needed.</p> <p>SPECIFIC COMMENTS</p> <p>ABSTRACT Line 19-21: Which antibiotics were used in this study? It should be given in Abstract section. Line 30: "E" should be "<i>Escherichia</i>".</p> <p>INTRODUCTION The introduction provided the necessary background information</p> <p>MATERIAL AND METHODS The research methodology for the study was appropriate and applied properly.</p> <p>RESULTS AND DISCUSSION Line 250 : Table 3 should be revised. It should be given like R (resistance), I (Intermediate) and S (Susceptible).</p> <p>The discussion about the antibiotic resistance part was not necessary. Antibiotic resistance at species level should be discussed.</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>REFERENCES</p> <p>References were complete and appropriate.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>In general manuscript is providing relevant information. Manuscript is written understandable way, however some corrections are needed.</p> <p>SPECIFIC COMMENTS</p> <p>ABSTRACT Line 19-21: Which antibiotics were used in this study? It should be given in Abstract section. Line 30: "E" should be "<i>Escherichia</i>".</p> <p>INTRODUCTION The introduction provided the necessary background information</p> <p>MATERIAL AND METHODS The research methodology for the study was appropriate and applied properly.</p> <p>RESULTS AND DISCUSSION Line 250 : Table 3 should be revised. It should be given like R (resistance), I (Intermediate) and S (Susceptible).</p> <p>The discussion about the antibiotic resistance part was not necessary. Antibiotic resistance at species level should be discussed.</p> <p>REFERENCES</p> <p>References were complete and appropriate.</p>	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>