



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Biotechnology Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BBJ_27517
Title of the Manuscript:	Phenotypic Detection of Virulence Markers, Antibiotic and Disinfectant Susceptibility of Bacterial Isolates from Automated Teller Machine Keypads, Computer Keyboards and Mice in Uyo, Nigeria
Type of the 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	- The term microbiota should be preferred over flora (line 10 of Abstract, page 1; line 1 and 5, page 9) - The amounts and concentrations of disinfectants with which the discs were impregnated should be indicated. More than that, the declared composition of the disinfectants should be given. Without knowing them, the last paragraph of page 10 does not make sense. - Tables should be carefully revised: For example, Table 2 (a % in the Total column is missing), Table 6 (foot legends or keys should explain NZ, a,b...), Table 7 (revise and organize the keys), Figs 4-10 (each one should have its own key) - There are a number of format errors such as extra spaces or lines along the manuscript (line 16, page 6; line 3, page 8, in this page we find also the foots of the Figs 1 and 3, that should be in the previous page; lines 12 and 23, page 9; line 1, page 10; the References section), - When reading (especially in the Discussion), it is very strange to find sentences such as: "16 reported..." (line 9, page 22). Better to say: Oloduro et al. (2011) reported..." Check the whole document since there are many places in which only the number of the reference appears. - Since the composition of the disinfectants used	We think flora is better and not microbiota. The concentrations of the disinfectants are shown in the Tables 6 and 7 Now added. Now added Now added Now corrected The formats of the paper was strictly followed



SDI Review Form 1.6

	is not given, the argument about their mechanism of action is not valid (lines 10-12, page 23). - The symbol > in line 19 of the page 23 should be substituted by words (meaning more than??). - The Reference section has to be revised thoroughly. There are many errors: extra spaces, extra lines, wrong line up, wrong justification, lack of volume, page..., titles with first letter of each word in capitals, other titles without capitals...	The compositions of the disinfectants need to be confidential Corrected Corrected
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	- In order to help the reading of the manuscript the order of quotation of the different surfaces studied (ATM, CK, CM) should be the same in Abstract, Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results, or any time the three of them are mentioned along the manuscript. - dettol should be written in capitals (line 19 of the Abstract, page 1) - Several studied, should be several estudies (line 5, page 2) - Are Figs 1, 2 and 3 needed? If so, the order of presentation should be the same as the one in which they are mentioned.	Corrected Corrected Corrected Yes, now corrected
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		