SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Annual Research & Review in Biology**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_ARRB_40765**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Molecular Detection of The Virulence Genes in Escherichia coli Isolated From Healthy and Diarrheic Calves in southern Iraq**
Type of the 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		
Minor REVISION comments	1. Grammatical errors 2. Methodology: - Authors should mention if ethical clearance is required for this study or not? If protocol was assessed by any scientific review board? - Molecular confirmation of bacterial isolates was based on virulence genes instead of species/genus-specific genes, example uid gene. The use of virulence genes to confirm identities can be misleading as not all strains are virulent or might possess the selected virulence determinants. Especially, as study included apparently healthy calves. - Studies like this require the use of controls to validate or authenticate procedures. Mention if any control - Positive and/or negative were included. - Mention statistical methods used in the study, if any. 3. Results: - Inconsistent numbering of figure example, "The results of conventional PCR analysis were shown in figures (a,b,c,d,e,f,g and h)" is seen as Figure 1 (A, B, C, D……..) - Table 2,3 etc: If possible perform a statistical analysis to compare between groups. What was the essence of grouping subjects into diarrhoegenic and non-diarrhoegenic if you are not comparing for any difference? - In the statement "Moreover, Table 4 shows the virulence gene arrangements in each *E.coli* isolate," gene arrangement sounds more of the alignment of genes on the chromosome, therefore, statement is misleading. Suggesting gene profile or combination of genes. - In the statement "the most toxic genes detected in the E.coli from colibacillosis" Most toxic is misleading because you are not referring to the potency of the toxins. Suggestion – the most common toxic genes. - Rephrase sentences with grammatical errors 4. Conclusions - From your result "It is concluded that E. coli isolates from healthy and diarrheic calves carried various virulence genes, of which the most frequent were Stx1, Stx2, hlyA and are present in a higher percentage of isolates from both diarrheic and nondiarrheic calves." What do you suggest or recommend? - I totally disagree with this statement "This study also a proves that PCR is accurate, rapid and is able to isolate pathogenic E. coli strains obtained from a random sampling of animals" You did not perform analytical tests on the reliability, precision, specificity and/or sensitivity of your methods. I suggest you remove or rephrase this statement. 5. Be consistent with your referencing style in the bibliography	

SDI Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Marie Ebob Agbortabot Bissong***
Department, University & Country	***Department of Biomedical Science, University of Bamenda, Cameroon***