



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Pathogen Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPR_51084
Title of the Manuscript:	Molecular diversity and extended spectrum beta-lactamase resistance of diarrheagenic Escherichia coli from patients attending selected health care facilities in Nasarawa State, 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>)

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>Material and methods; Line 54; 2.1 is missing, probably sample collection should be numbered as 2.1 Line 95; The word comparism should be changed to comparison Line 128; Table 2: The words aplicon and amplimer should be changed to amplicon Line 145: Rephrase the sentence</p> <p>Isolation & Identifications: Which control strains were used?</p> <p>Results and Discussion Authors should review the numbering of tables Line 167: Occurrence of <i>E. coli</i> in relation to to age and gender is shown in table 4 & 5, not 3& 4 Line 169: Molecular detection of ESBL production in <i>E. coli</i> isolates is shown in table 6,not 5 Line 180: Co-existence of ESBL is shown in table 7 , not 6 Line 184: Distribution of resistant strain is shown in table 9 not 7</p> <p>Competing Interest Authors should declare competing interest</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Sample collection is renumbered as 2.1 in Line 54 ii. The word comparism was changed to comparison in Line 95 iii. Line 128; Table 2: The words aplicon and amplimer were changed to amplicon iv. Line 145: The sentence was rephrased v. Isolation & Identifications: Standard microbiological methods were used, hence no control strain used in Isolation and Identification. vi. Numbering of tables was reviewed. vii. Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Abstract: Abstract is informative, however the methodology section should be improved</p>	The methodology section in the abstract has been improved.
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is a well written & informative, however, author should work on the comments addressed above	Thank you for the compliments. All the comments addressed were worked on.

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	There were no ethical issues in the manuscript