



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEA_19985
Title of the Manuscript:	Molecular Characterization and Antibiotic Resistance Profile of Bacteria Associated with <i>Clarias gariepinus</i> (Burchell, 1822) From Ebute Iboro Location on Yewa River
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	This paper describes the isolation of bacteria from <i>C. gariepinus</i> and the following evaluation of antibiotics sensitivity of the isolates. The purpose of this study is reasonable and therefore the information obtained here will be useful for food supply by aquaculture. However, major revision is necessary for publication. 1. The style and contents of the manuscript are inconsistent. This is probably because the manuscript was prepared only by collecting paragraphs and figures & tables written by each author and no editing of the whole manuscript has been done by the responsible author. As a result, different kinds of fonts are used and the quality of English changes depending on paragraphs. There are figures and tables containing almost the same information. Edit the whole manuscript and ask a native English speaker (preferably a scientist) to examine the revised manuscript. 2. Amend the following misleading words and expressions. Lines 123-124 'Table 1' here should be Table 2. 'Table 2' should be Table 1. Line 128-132 In this paragraph, authors say that they tested '10 samples' in Plate 1. However, 20 samples were actually subjected to electrophoresis in Plate 1. Authors also mention that 'ten	The whole manuscript has been edited in line with observations made. The tables have been numbered appropriately



SDI Review Form 1.6

	types' of bacterial species are identified by BLAST search. However, according to Tables 3 and 4, '16 bacterial strains belonging to 10 genera' is the correct phrase to be used. In this paragraph, authors also reported the names of 15 isolates identified here but <i>Cronobacter spp</i> is missing. Plate 1 can be removed when it is described in the text that all of PCR products had the sizes of 1.6 kbp. Line 140 What does '25kg size' mean? Line 153-156 What does the % value mean? Authors should define that this is the ratio of 20 isolates resistant (sensitive) to the corresponding antibiotics. Use the following expression: "30% of the isolates were sensitive to antibiotics X" instead of "antibiotics X was 30% sensitive to the isolates". Add the full names of CRX and CPR. Fig. 1 Remove this figure because the information in this figure is already present in Table 3. Table 4 Add accession numbers of GenBank for nearest relatives. Fig. 2 Remove this figure because the information in this figure is described in Table 4. Table 5 Add the legend that C1 to C16 are the strains identified in Table 4. C17 to C20 are unidentified strains. Authors emphasize that some antibiotics are effective to	Authors have corrected the number of samples to 20 and used the correct phrase of 16 bacterial strains belonging to 10 genera. <i>Cronobacter spp</i> has been listed. Authors are of the opinion that Plate 1, should be retained for purpose of emphasis. The opening part of line 140 containing 25kg has been deleted to avoid ambiguity. Lines 153 – 156 have been rewritten as suggested. The full names of CRX and CPR have been included. Figure 1 has been removed. Figure 2 has been removed The legend to table 5 has been added.
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	the bacterial isolates. However, isolates C8 to C15 are resistant to all the antibiotics tested here. This is important information suggesting that these isolates must be considered seriously when they are pathogenic. This should be noted in Results and Discussion. No weight value (mg) of Ciprofloxacin (CPR) in the Note. Fig. 3 Remove this figure. It contains a lot of mistakes. No unit, a wrong name of antibiotics and wrong data. Similar information can be obtained from Table 6. Lines 272-282 These properties of the isolates should be in Results but not in Discussion. Lines 288-295 This paragraph contains confused use of % sensitivity to antibiotics. For example, the sentence "C1, C2, C4 and C7 are 30% sensitive to ofloxacin" may be understood by readers as "30% of these isolates are sensitive". But all of these isolates (C1, C2, C4 and C7) are sensitive to ofloxacin. Only 30% of 20 isolates are sensitive to ofloxacin. References Some of the references lack journal names and volume/page numbers. Check the followings. Akinyemi et al. (2004) Boyd (1979) Boyd & Lichtkoppler (1995) Swingle (1961) Tubagas et al. (2009)	This observation has been noted in the result. Figure 3 has been removed. This section has been moved to the result section. This paragraph has been rewritten to make it more explicit. References have been corrected and rewritten according to Journal style.
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Correct English words. Line 13, Table 4 homologous---> homology Lines18 and 20 bacteria isolates---> bacterial isolates Line 32 bacterial capable of---> bacteria capable of Line 44 Bacteria disease---> Bacterial disease Similar missuses are found throughout the manuscript.	Words wrongly used have been corrected.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		