



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Biotechnology Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BBJ_27279
Title of the Manuscript:	CHARACTERIZATION AND DISTRIBUTION OF PATHOGENIC MICROORGANISMS ALONG KABIANGA RIVER WATER BETWEEN JANUARY AND MARCH 2016 IN KERICHO COUNTY, KENYA
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 (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>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Introduction: Line: 26-28 where do you get the results of the statement. Line: 33 between water and in there should be full stop. From line: 26- 69, the researcher is just reporting on what other researchers have done. Line: 70-71 abbreviation is wrong place the work, it should be after acknowledgement Line: 72: Methods and Materials, it should be materials and method. Line: 75-76, the study site has increased number of people living around and this river is a major source of water .This statement should be in results. General Comment on materials and Methods, There is no clear distinction between materials and methods, all the Idea are cluster together, it is not a scientific report	Checked Corrected Corrected Checked Corrected Corrections



SDI Review Form 1.6

	.On the other hand the report is not in Chronological order, it lost it focus because results and discussion is not well presented .In abstract from Line: 5-23, the researcher did not measured anything about their finding but only what other have done. Line: 173 table 1the units are not uniform, same as table 2.	Corrected
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	General Comment on materials and Methods, There is no clear distinction between materials and methods, all the Idea are cluster together, it is not a scientific report .On the other hand the report is not in Chronological order, it lost it focus because results and discussion is not well presented .In abstract from Line: 5-23, the researcher did not measured anything about their finding but only what other have done. Let them go through articles published in your journal and do the necessary corrections before publication.	Corrections made