



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_45445
Title of the Manuscript:	Molecular characterization and prevalence of antibiotic resistance in Escherichia coli isolated from raw goat milk
Type of the Article	Original Research Papers

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The introduction section did not provide the necessary background information. It should be added some points (especially antibiotic resistance of E. coli strains). 2. Manuscript title is not found to be compatible with the content. It should be. 3. The aim of the manuscript is not fully expressed. 4. Are references strains used in this study? It should be given. 5. Molecular identification of E. coli strains is not fully expressed in abstract, material and method, result and discussion section. It should be given some detail 6. It should be given details in 2.2.Isolation and Identification of E. coli. The authors say that biochemical description was made. (see 3.1.). However, there are no expressions about biochemical tests in 2.2. Which tests were made? Did molecular identification of strains make? 7. The results of analysis are not enough. 	
Minor REVISION comments	-	
Optional/General comments	<p>In general manuscript is providing relevant information. Manuscript is written understandable way, however some corrections are needed.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The introduction section did not provide the necessary background information. It should be added some points (especially antibiotic resistance of E. coli strains). 2. Manuscript title is not found to be compatible with the content. It should be. 3. The aim of the manuscript is not fully expressed. 4. Are references strains used in this study? It should be given. 5. Molecular identification of E. coli strains is not fully expressed in abstract, material and method, result and discussion section. It should be given some detail 6. It should be given details in 2.2.Isolation and Identification of E. coli. The authors say that biochemical description was made. (see 3.1.). However, there are no expressions about biochemical tests in 2.2. Which tests were made? Did molecular identification of strains make? 7. The results of analysis are not enough. 	

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>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Pinar Sanlibaba</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Ankara University, Turkey</i>