



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>	<p>i. Sample collection is renumbered as 2.1 in Line 54</p> <p>ii. The word comparism was changed to comparison in Line 95</p> <p>iii. Line 128; Table 2: The words aplicon and amplimer were changed to amplicon</p> <p>iv. Line 145: The sentence was rephrased</p> <p>v. Isolation & Identifications: Standard microbiological methods were used, hence no control strain used in Isolation and Identification.</p> <p>vi. Numbering of tables was reviewed.</p> <p>vii. Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	Abstract: Abstract is informative, however the methodology section should be improved	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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	There were no ethical issues in the manuscript