



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOB_39840
Title of the Manuscript:	An integrating approach of bacteriophage and iron antagonizing molecule for eradication of biofilm of E. coli isolated from clinical samples of Sylhet city, Bangladesh
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Abstract. This section needs modification. Authors clearly have to establish which is the aim, now I did not understand which was the aim? A general aim. Then I did not see the material and methods, here authors need to include the methods they used (briefly), and variables they measured. For example, I don't know where the bacteriophages are coming from? I guess the bacteriophages they used are against <i>Escherichia</i>. Also I did not understand how the biofilm was measured? Etc. The abstract did not show what this work is focus in. ZnSO₄, should be ZnSO₄, also Zinc should zinc. MATERIAL AND METHODS. Line 65, Why these strains were used as a positive or negative control? <i>E. coli</i> PHL628 and <i>E. coli</i> PHL565, one induced biofilm and other not? What this previously reported? line 67-68. Here is missing the method (technique) the authors used to measure the biofilm??? line 70. The concentration of Zn 500uM was used as previously described? line 76, Once again, the method the authors used for develop the biofilm formation is the microtiter plate method, but to measure the biofilm? do you mean crystal violet method assay in microtiter plate? Line 130-133. This part is not clear, for example: "...bacteria were detached from one of control wells..." I don't know how the cells were detached? What does it mean control well? , "substances of all Wells were removed".. do you mean, Wells were washed with? etc. Line 148, "previously mentioned procedure was followed"... one again, which procedure for doing what??? Here is not clear... Line 152, this experiments were not mentioned in the abstract. Line 190, what does it mean Young 2nd day? Are you talking about the culture, if so, maybe you can use the hours, instead the word young. Graphs. In graphs I can see the standard deviation but in material and methods did not mention the statistical analysis, neither the repetitions in each experiment. Also, in results, authors should use the statistical analysis to explain if there is significance in the readings. Line 227-232, and Table 1, actually, it is not usual to present the results of antibiotics in diameter in Kirby Bauer method, authors should have to interpret the results using the CLSI manual (and look the range for <i>E. coli</i> for each antibiotic) and determine if there are resistant, sensible, or intermediate strains. Along the manuscript are using hours, you have to use the abbreviation. Line 276, once again, here are using the "younger biofilm" maybe you can use the time (h) of the develop of the biofilm. In the discussion, I think that authors, should support the results base on statistical analysis. Some parts of the discussion sound like results. Also, I did not find any discussion about the antibiotics. The antibiotic results were	Thank you very much for your valuable comments.



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

	not mentioned in the discussion but nither in the abstract, I did not understand why this part was included in the work if it is not discussed. References. Authors should check the references, there are some mistakes, for example, Escherichia coli should be italized in the reference 6, reference 11, some letters are capital, ref 18, should be vulnificus in, ref 20 looks it is other kind of letter, ref 29 there are capital letters.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		