



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BMRJ_19952
Title of the Manuscript:	MICROBIOLOGICAL EXAMINATION OF HOUSEHOLD KITCHEN SPONGES FROM THREE COMMUNITIES IN IKWUANO L. G. A, UMUAHIA, ABIA 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 (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	-Write abstract as it's indicated by the journal guidelines (specify different sections aim, place, method, result, conclusion). - In line 32, change "offers" to " offer" . - In line 35, change "are capable of causing" to "are capable to cause". - In line 73, specify names of authors then write number of the reference in the following sentence: The method of sample collection described by Lancette and Tatini was used [7]. This same remark is done in line 127. Correct that in the whole manuscript. - In line 101, do authors mean "four"? - Cultural and microscopic examinations are not enough to identify microorganisms. Authors should use PCR, sequencing too. - In line 128, change "with the findings here" in "with our findings" -Authors should discuss the occurrence of <i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i> in other studies and not the presence of <i>L. monocytogenes</i>. It doesn't serve deeply the discussion. - Add a reference in line 144. - In line 157, change "refrigeratosr" to "refrigerators". - In line 180, change "$3.60 \times 10^7 \times 9.7 \times 10^7$cfu/ml" into "$3.60 \times 10^7 - 9.7 \times 10^7$cfu/ml". - Avoid long sentences, reformulate these following sentences in line 211: Most sponges used in the rural communities are made of <u>fiber</u>	Line 32: "offers" was changed to "offer" Line 35: "are capable of causing" was changed to "are capable to cause". Line 73: correction effected here and elsewhere. Line 128: "with the findings here" replaced with "with our findings" Correction effected here. Line 144: reference was added. Line 180: correction effected. Line 211: correction effected .



SDI Review Form 1.6

	and there are also natural sponges this also leads to rapid colonization..”. References - Write names of journal in abbreviations. -Authors can gather tables 4, 5 and 6 in one table by adding one line in which they specify different regions from which samples were taken. - Authors can merge ideas of tables 7 and 8 in tables 7. This is my suggestion: write R (or I, S) and add the value inhibition diameter of each antibiotic into brackets. - In table 7, I think that <u>Augmentin</u> Is the commercial name of the antibiotic and not the active bio-substance of the antibiotic. Thus, authors should write antibiotic names such as penicillin, tetracycline and not the commercial names.	Journal names written in abbreviations. Tables 4, 5 and 6 cannot be merged because the values cannot fit into single table. There is no Table 8 in the manuscript. R, I or S has been inserted where needed. Manuscript is in line with the comment. All the corrections effected in the manuscript are highlighted in yellow colour where necessary.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		