



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BMRJ_27557
Title of the Manuscript:	QUALITY AND MICROBIAL ASSESSMENT OF WATER USED BY THE RESIDENTS OF KABIANGA FROM THE DIFFERENT SOURCES
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	1. The title of the manuscript cannot be “ Quality and Microbial assessment” Since the work was just on the microbial assessment. No work was done on the physic-chemical parameters of the water. 2. Abstract should be sub-sectioned per the journals guidelines. 3. The entire Introduction needs reorganization with current references. (A lot of similar work has been done even in 2015 and 2016) 4. The Methodology was somehow flawed. Different number of samples were taken from the three sources; River water (11), Well water (4) and Spring water (3), yet, no statistics were given to explain the results. 5. The Results should be supported with relevant statistical analysis. 6. The Discussion should be supported with not less than 12 – 15 references and give scientific reasons to the results in the Discussion. 7. All the scientific names should be italicized. Example, <i>E. coli</i>	1. Title refined, water quality also determined by microbial assessment. 2. Corrected 3. Latest references included 4. Methodology well explained. 5. Statistical analysis was not done. 6. Discussion improved. 7. Scientific nomenclature adhered to. 8. Results in the pie chart highlighted 9. Corrected 10. Corrected 11. Corrected Corrected Presented in percentages. Corrected



SDI Review Form 1.6

	8. The pie chart in the Result is not identified. 9. What has been identified as Figures in the Results section, should be changed to Plates. 10. Should be consistent with the Journal's guide to authors on the References and referencing. 11. References are too old.	Done
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	1. The few grammatical errors should be corrected, past tense should be used when discussing results. 2. I have passed some comments, suggestions and made corrections in the main text with sticky notes and in some cases, highlighted with yellow colouration.	Corrections made Corrections made.