

[Review Form 2](#)

Book Name:	Research Perspectives of Microbiology and Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_3726
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevalence and Antimicrobial Susceptibility Patterns of Salmonella Species, Shigella Species and Escherichia coli among Children Suffering from Diarrhoea in Unguja Zanzibar, Tanzania
Type of the Article	BOOK CHAPTER

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it addresses the prevalence and antimicrobial susceptibility of three major diarrhoeagenic pathogens— <i>Salmonella spp.</i> , <i>Shigella spp.</i> , and <i>Escherichia coli</i> —in children under five in Zanzibar. Understanding these patterns is critical for informing public health strategies, optimizing antimicrobial use, and combating resistance. The findings are relevant for low-resource settings where diarrhoeal diseases contribute significantly to childhood morbidity and mortality.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable as it accurately reflects the content and focus of the study. However, a slight modification could make it more engaging: Suggested Title: "Prevalence and Antimicrobial Resistance of Diarrhoeagenic Pathogens in Under-Five Children in Zanzibar, Tanzania."	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is mostly comprehensive but could be improved by: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Adding specific statistical outcomes, such as p-values, to strengthen the scientific rigor. Including a brief mention of the study's implications for public health policy and future research. Clarifying multidrug resistance findings, as this part of the abstract is slightly ambiguous. 	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript is well-structured with clear subsections, covering introduction, methodology, results, discussion, and conclusion. However: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The "Results and Discussion" section could be split into separate sections for more precise analysis and comparison. The flow of some subsections, such as "Sample Collection" and "Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing," could be improved to avoid redundancy. 	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound due to its adherence to standard microbiological techniques (e.g., Kirby-Bauer method). It is strengthened by its ethical adherence and a well-defined sampling process. The use of appropriate statistical tools, however, is limited, and the study could benefit from inferential statistics to validate its conclusions. The discussion aligns well with the results, but the lack of molecular data and in-depth exploration of resistance mechanisms slightly weakens its impact.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and include recent and relevant studies. However, incorporating additional global studies on antimicrobial resistance trends could provide a broader context for the findings.	

Review Form 2

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1. Language quality is suitable but could be improved by simplifying sentences for clarity. 2. Redundant terms like “highly susceptible” or “lowly susceptible” should be revised. 3. Tables and figures need better formatting for ease of interpretation.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript has practical implications for the healthcare system in Zanzibar and similar settings. Expanding on the public health implications and providing actionable recommendations would enhance its value.	

PART 2:

	<u>Reviewer's comment</u>	<u>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>
<u>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Vannala Raju
Department, University & Country	Trr Institute of Medical Sciences, India