



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJTDH_14277
Title of the Manuscript:	Physicochemical and thermotolerant faecal coliforms quality of commercial bottled water in Dar es Salaam city in Tanzania
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. There are spelling mistakes (for eg. Fecal & Faecal, use either) and quality of English needs improvement. Also needs word separation wherever needed, may be formatting default. 2. Line 76. Traits or parameters 3. Sample size seems to be very low- 10. just one sample from each brand? At least replication might have increases sample size. No Power to the study. It needs to be seen by a statistician. 4. When earlier studied were available, why this study has been done again with a low sample size? 5. Sample 11 is control and not of a manufacturer in all tables. Please separate it.	• Corrected; used fecal instead of faecal. • Word separation effected Parameters With bottled water, one bottle represents status of a batch, hence contamination might mean health hazard in the concerned batch. Kassenga's study of 2007 sample was 13 brands, our study sampled 10 brands; our findings advances knowledge on bottled water safety in 2014. Tap water is consumed raw by majority of people, was included not as a control but for risk comparison with bottled water
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. In table 2. Serial numbers are not correctly ordered.	Ordered
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Article needs to be improved on scientific grounds with major revision and additional supporting data or information along with a strongly highlighting the importance of study. At present study does not seem to be important.	Manuscript corrected