



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_32281
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation Of Microbial Pathogens In Biofilms Of Deteriorating Fish In A Suburb of Ogun State, South-western 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 (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		
Minor REVISION comments	Line 84, 92: It was better to had done experiments in triplicate instead of duplicate. Line 100: It should be 37°C and not 37^oC Line 105: Attention for CFU definition. CFU/g or/ml, meaning colony forming unit per unit of measure or how many capable-of-living microbes are in a certain measurement. Spaces: lines 114, 132 Tables 1-5: it should be performed three times. Line 199: should be mentioned that results result from means. References: improve this field. The most recent is from 2010, recent research? Line 155: how is it possible to introduce a reference with no previous publishing work?	I agree that the more replications we have, the better the means. However, most if not all the reviewed literature I studied did duplicates rather than triplicates. I will note for subsequent studies. Correction for this in Line 100 and other lines have been addressed. The space issue in Lines 114 and 132 have been addressed. Line 199: Correction has been effected and line rephrased. More current references till 2017 have been included. However, there was a reference for 2012. This speaks to Line 250 rather than Line 155. The paper in question is interestingly the most referenced work in Food Microbiology in Nigeria. It is peer-reviewed but unpublished. I have seen benchmark Post-graduate thesis cited. Can a peer-reviewed but unpublished work not be cited?
Optional/General comments		