



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 <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	Results Maybe the total viable count could be expressed in logs₁₀. I think it will be better for discussion and comparison between households in three different communities. Conclusion It seems to be poor. It's well known that the following is true: 234 The kitchen sponges analyzed in this work were contaminated and could cause health challenges 235 to the uses. The risk would be lowered when sponges are kept dry, partly because bacterial 236 growth and survival would be reduced. The use of various disinfectants in domestic washing of 237 cooking utensils would aid in eliminating these pathogens. As it is sad in the Introduction... "simple fast and effective methods to disinfect kitchen sponges may prevent the spread of pathogenic microorganisms in household kitchens and may lead to better food preservation and fewer cases of foodborne illnesses [6]." But in this work you focus on microbial flora and their resistance on various antibiotics. So conclusion should be in that sence. RECOMMENDATIONS	Remarks made about the conclusion and recommendation have been fully corrected in the manuscript and highlighted in yellow colour.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	I am not sure that recommendation should be so simple. It seems that additional analysis should be done to improve the hygienic status of kitchen sponges. Recommendation as it is now could be the part of discussion but not the separate chapter.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Be careful and check spellings and errors in the technical sense (brackets, separating commas) through the text. Be careful in starting the sentence with number – it is better to change the words order, or name the authors. Example: L 136 or 141, 159 etc. As this article is recommended for original scientific article I think more efforts need to be invested in interpretation of the results and conclusions.	The comments raised here have been corrected and highlighted in yellow colour.