



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_44505
Title of the Manuscript:	Bacteriological Quality and Antibigram of Isolates Obtained from Creek Town River, Odukpani L.G.A., Cross River State, Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original Research Paper

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	The abstract needs to be properly presented	The abstract has been worked on, and properly presented.
Minor REVISION comments	Abstract: i. Line 13: the sentence "There was a significant difference in..." should come first before reporting the result in line 11. The author should follow the same trend in line 23-25. ii. Line 18: The author should just report the observed highest and lowest cfu iii. Enterobacter has already been mentioned in line 17, therefore subsequent one should be abbreviated (line 19) as <i>E. faecalis</i> iv. Line 20: "indicate" should be in past tense. "Is" should be changed to "was" v. Line 22: the author should note that for the word "however" to be used, it must have a direct contrast with the previous sentence. As such, the usage here is not appropriate. "Moreover" could be more suitable. vi. The author should report the highest and lowest observed results only. This will make the abstract not to be too ambiguous to read. vii. Line 26: the sentence should be in the past tense i.e indicated Introduction: i. Line 34: this could be better reframed as "...and a life support..." ii. Line 42: "however" is wrongly used here. iii. Author should join paragraph 2 (line 42) and paragraph 3 (line 49) together. This could start with paragraph 3 e.g. "In Nigeria, lack of portable water supply..." iv. Line 66: remove "however", start with "in spite". Just as I mentioned earlier (wrong usage). v. Join the last two paragraphs together (line 66 and 71). Methodology: i. Line 88: Sample collection: the author fails to mention the significant of having multiple sample collection of the river water with different codes. The question is: a. Is the collected samples from the same spot or not. If not, why? b. What is the significant of morning and evening samples collection? All these information will buttress the mind of the readers. It will also make the inclusion of CTR3 and CTR2 as reported in the abstract clearer. ii. Line 115: the sentence should be joined to the previous paragraph (line 114) iii. The author fails to consistently maintained the unit of time (compare line 120,121 and 114) Result: i. The results of the sensitivity tests could have been clearer if the author could at least provide a plate showing the degree of sensitivity of the antibiotics. ii. Line 273; Table 2 should be placed in a properly formatted table and not disjointed as shown. iii. Paragraph in line 234 should be joined with that of line 236. Conclusion: i. 1st line: the word "total" should be used once. Also "exceed" should be pluralised.	All the errors raised here (Abstract, Introduction, Methodology, Result, Discussion, Conclusion and Reference) have been corrected and properly presented



SDI Review Form 1.6

	ii. 3rd line: should be re-written as "...were known to be pathogenic" References: i. These should be formatted according to Science domain standard. Having said that, some of the references are not consistent with others e.g. No 7 &8; citation's Years were written twice.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	No ethical issues