



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJRIMPS_36387</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>ASSESSMENT OF THE MICROBIOLOGICAL SAFETY OF POTABLE WATER FROM RURAL SETTLEMENTS IN OWO LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA OF ONDO STATE, NIGERIA</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Abstract.</b> Please condense and describe what was measured exactly.</p> <p><b>Materials and Methods</b> Lines 79-87. The sample number is low and the "random sampling technique" raises questions about whether the data are representative. This needs to be addressed in the Discussion.</p>	<p>Abstract will be condensed as suggested</p> <p>Line 79-87 sample number were determined by the water sources present in the area, unfortunately, only a surface water and ground water source serve each settlement region of which we picked samples across the settlements</p> <p>"random sampling technique" was adopted for different location points in the flowing stream water sources to eliminate bias and get a representative sample of the target population.</p>
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Abstract</b> Line 11. "microbiological safety" was not addressed, rather simply use the sentence in lines 15-17. Line 14. "quality of drinking water" is imprecise. Lines 11 and 14. Delete these sentences and simply use the sentence in lines 15-17 (after correction) Line 17. "assessed by various biochemical tests" was not performed; rather biochemical tests were used to identify isolates. Lines 17-20. As the values for fecal coliforms and enterococci were similar, was there any correlation between samples? Did fecal coliform positive samples yield enterococci? Lines 17-20. Inspection of Table 2 (Fecal Coliform CFU), shows that 70 % of samples yielded fecal coliforms, not 35 %. Please rationalize data in the Tables with the text.</p>	<p>Abstract All corrections effected as suggested</p> <p>Introduction Correction effected as suggested</p> <p>Methodology Line 79-87 sample number were determined by the water sources present in the area, unfortunately, only one surface water source and one ground water source served each settlement region of which we picked samples across sample sources are low (20), random sampling technique had to be adopted to determine the location points for sample</p>



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	<p>Line 18. Presence not “contamination”  Line 19. Presence, “growth” is incorrect  Lines 22-27. Delete, as these sentences repeat what is acknowledged in lines 7-9.  <b>Introduction</b>  Lines 31-41. Unnecessary and can be deleted as the second paragraph focuses attention on the objective of the work.  <b>Materials and Methods</b>  Lines 79-87. The sample number is low and the “random sampling technique” raise questions about whether the data are representative. This needs to be addressed in the Discussion.  <b>Results</b>  Lines 125-129. First, “were verified” is imprecise; please substitute identified.  Lines 127-129. Were the multiple isolates from the same sample (Table 5) clones or distinct isolates?  Lines 132-141. Isn't it standard practice to report water microbial counts as CFU/100 mL (Tables 1-3)?  <b>Discussion</b>  Lines 193-216. Please comment on whether it is felt that the low number of samples and random selection of sites is still representative.  <b>Conclusion</b>  Lines 217-225. Unnecessary  Table 4. Unnecessary and can be deleted  Table 5. Please consider making it Table 1.</p>	<p>collection in the stream water sources.  Therefore, “random sampling technique” was adopted for different location points in the flowing stream water sources to eliminate bias and get a representative sample of the target population. This has now been included in the discussion.</p> <p><b>Results</b>  Lines 125-129 corrected as suggested  Lines 127-129  Multiple isolates were distinct isolates obtained</p> <p>Lines 132-141  Water TBC can be reported as CFU/100mL using the Most probable number method, however, it can also be expressed in CFU/1 mL of water if the researcher adopts the pour plate technique; we adopted the latter as our preferred choice and hence we reported at CFU/1mL [14-16]  <b>Conclusion</b>  Adjustments made as suggested  Table 4 was included to indicate the arrays of biochemical tests used to identify the isolates and we feel it is ethical to include it.  Table 5 was agreed by the authors to be made the last.</p> <p>Kind regards.</p>
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments		