



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIMPS_36387
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF THE MICROBIOLOGICAL SAFETY OF POTABLE WATER FROM RURAL SETTLEMENTS IN OWO LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA OF ONDO STATE, NIGERIA
Type of the Article	Original Research 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 <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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>Abstract. Please condense and describe what was measured exactly.</p> <p>Materials and Methods 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>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>Abstract 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. 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.</p> <p>Introduction</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Lines 31-41. Unnecessary and can be deleted as the second paragraph focuses attention on the objective of the work.</p> <p>Materials and Methods</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Results</p> <p>Lines 125-129. First, "were verified" is imprecise; please substitute identified.</p> <p>Lines 127-129. Were the multiple isolates from the same sample (Table 5) clones or distinct isolates?</p> <p>Lines 132-141. Isn't it standard practice to report water microbial counts as CFU/100 mL (Tables 1-3)?</p> <p>Discussion</p> <p>Lines 193-216. Please comment on whether it is felt that the low number of samples and random selection of sites is still representative.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>Lines 217-225. Unnecessary</p> <p>Table 4. Unnecessary and can be deleted</p> <p>Table 5. Please consider making it Table 1.</p>	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Joseph O. Falkinham</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Department of Biological Sciences, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, USA</i>