

Paper: “Study of Escherichia coli as a Cause of Diarrhoea in the Ashanti Region of Ghana”

Submitted: 20 June 2023

Accepted: 20 September 2023

Published: 30 September 2023

Corresponding Author: Frank Awuah

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n27p314](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n27p314)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Amal Talib Al Sa'ady
Babylon University, Iraq

Reviewer 2: Fattma Abody
College of Medicine, Hawler Medical University, Erbil, Iraq

Reviewer 3: Djadjiti Namla
Nile University, Nigeria

Reviewer 4: Blinded

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Yes, the title is adequate and suitable

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Yes, clearly presents the objects, methods, and results.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

yes ,few

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Yes, vary clear

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

Yes it was clear but contain some errors

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

No the conclusions need to rewriting it

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

yes but contains some errors

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

THE Rerearch not Contains Ethic and some information without references and need to rearrange the age groups if you can

Reviewer B:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

title needs rewriting to be
" Study of Escherichia coli as a Cause of diarrhea in the ashanti region of ghana "

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

- 1- The abstract should be written according to the journal's instructions
- 2- It is necessary to write the full scientific name of the bacteria in the abstract

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

yes

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

- 1- It is necessary to mention the official names of hospitals and their addresses
- 2- What do you mean of "0-5" years ??? " zero years"????
- 3- Was the sample collection continued for 18 months?
- 4- A reference must be included for each method
- 5- Primers sequence must be documented in a table with explain e the purpose of each one

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

- 1- Some of the abbreviations mentioned in the manuscript need to mention the full term.
- 2- The font of writing must be uniform in the manuscript text.
- 3- The name of the genes should be written according to international standards as found in NCBI
- 4- Images showing PCR results should be included

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Conclusions need to be rewritten in a clear and concise scientific manner

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

- 1- some references are not included in the list of references
- 2- there are very old references
- 3- some references are not cited in the text

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

- title needs rewriting to be " Study of Escherichia coli as a Cause of diarrhea in the ashanti region of ghana "
- The abstract should be written according to the journal's instructions
- It is necessary to write the full scientific name of the bacteria in the abstract
- It is necessary to mention the official names of hospitals and their addresses
- What do you mean of "0-5" years ??? " zero years"????
- Was the sample collection continued for 18 months?
- A reference must be included for each method
- Primers sequence must be documented in a table with explain e the purpose of each one
- Images showing PCR results should be included some references are not included in the list of references
- there are very old references
- some references are not cited in the text

Reviewer C:

Recommendation: See Comments

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title does not really look catchy. It should be rephrased to include the specific demography involved in the study.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract seems acceptable. But the aim is not clear enough to match the title.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

The body of the work is okay. However, there are a few grammatical errors:

- L11: insert a comma after “agents”
- L37: should be “die” not “dies”
- L174 & 175: (typo: review the title of the table and the Keys you provided)
- L184: remove “the” from “... ETEC with the that...”
- L187: change to “exhibit”
- L225: should be “ages” not “age” and insert a comma after “Also”
- L240: should be “sample” not “samples”
- L349: should be “be explained by”
- L368: insert a comma after “study”
- L369: insert a comma after “therefore”
- L388: remove “the”
- L390: remove “the”

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The methods in this study are okay. But the nucleotide sequences of primers used should be written down. For the UV spectrophotometry, the wavelengths at which the DNA bands were viewed should be mentioned as well.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The body of the manuscript is acceptable. But has a few errors which are indicated above from previous comments.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The conclusion and summary tally with the content of the paper. But to improve the overall quality of this manuscript, then the aim has to be reviewed (refer to previous comments).

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Good.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

This paper is a good one and needs just a few amendments.

The title could be rewritten as “Diarrheagenic E. coli Pathotypes in Selected Patients from the Ashanti Region of Ghana”. And the aim could be stated as “This research work sought to detect and identify diarrheagenic E. coli in selected patients from the Ashanti region of Ghana using conventional multiplex PCR”.

Reviewer D:

Recommendation: Resubmit Elsewhere

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title is clear and it is adequate for this article.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Abstract: The abstract is not clear. Sample collection was not well described. The following were not stated in the abstract: category of people sampled, where they hospital based or community based. How the stool samples were collected, how cultured and how identified were missing. It was not clear what constitute symptomatic and non-symptomatic patients. In the concluding part it was stated that men were more susceptible to diarrhoea than females, the basis for which was not explained.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

Methodology: The methods employed in the identification of the E. coli was not adequate. Culture was done on MacConkey, identified by the indole test. Use of EMB medium was mentioned but not clearly stated how this helped in the identification of the E. coli strains. Multiplex PCR was used used to detect the genes coding virulence in the E. coli pathotypes. Here were all the various genes run in one-go multiplex PCR? How many were run at a time. It appears there were 11 genes tested for. All together for forward and reverse will be too clumsy and cluttered. There were no gel pictures to support the claims.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Methodology: The methods employed in the identification of the E. coli was not adequate. Culture was done on MacConkey, identified by the indole test. Use of EMB medium was mentioned but not clearly stated how this helped in the identification of the E. coli strains. Multiplex PCR was used to detect the genes coding virulence in the E. coli pathotypes. Here were all the various genes run in one-go multiplex PCR?

How many were run at a time. It appears there were 11 genes tested for. All together for forward and reverse will be too clumsy and cluttered. There were no gel pictures to support anything.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The body: The body of the paper contains many tables in the results section which were not self-explanatory. tables 1 and 3 can be merged conveniently. It not clear what table 2 was describing. Table 4 describes the distribution of the virulence factors. It is not clear what information is obtainable, since these were the very factors tested for. Rather it would be informative to tell what E. coli pathotypes are associated with the age groups. otherwise, is there any age group a particular pathotype would not infect? would be a better approach. The discussion was results rewritten and repeated in different words.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The conclusion should be written to conform with the objectives. What is presented is not adequate.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

In-text citations were adequate and properly listed. The autors used APA referencing style.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the **BODY** of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the **CONCLUSION** of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

*Please rate the **REFERENCES** of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

This article can be reviewed be reviewed. Data generated can be analyzed again to answer the objectives.

Reviewer E:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title needs slight modification as suggested in the reviewed manuscript

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Good

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

Few grammatical errors should be corrected as indicated in the reviewed manuscript

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Good

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

Good

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Good

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The reference list should be audited as marked in the attached manuscript.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

All necessary comments have been indicated in the attached manuscript. Authors should review the manuscript accordingly.
