



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_44134
Title of the Manuscript:	FUNGAL POLLUTION OF INDOOR AIR OF SOME HEALTH FACILITIES IN RIVERS STATE.
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>)

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	Line 18 Please supply papers dealing with residual formaldehyde (solid or gas). Lines 22 and 25 delete heavily and replace to XX CFU/m3 and so on. You can find out the figure in my original research paper in past. Citation 17 is only discussed on Bacteria only, not fungi. Line 27 following an organic substrate please supply citation to support this description. Line 57 delete room temperature to the temperature you used for cultivation. SDA is at 20-25 °C. Room temperature is not scientific expression. Line 63 2.3 Please supply how do you calculate overlayed colonies with bacteria and fungi, fungi and fungi. Line 63 2,3 Please supply pictures of overlayed colony plates as examples. Line 63 2.3 Your collection method is falling bacryeria/fungi but this method is qualitatively due to effect of air, so air sampler is recommended. So I asked you why you did not use air sampler, which is more quantitative method. Line 64 2.4 You do not use DNA sequence identification method for this study? Why? Line 73 Result and Discussion as the sampling hours in the morning and evening are not defined in the paper, so I suspect that morning is before noon (lunch time) and evening is before end of work. If so the origin of the bacteria and/or fungi is human, therefore both may mot have significant difference as is citation 12 and your result. Line 105 and so on Identification of fungi should be carried out using DNA sequence matting. Which equipment is available in the market.	The gases were not part of this study. The references supporting the statement has been highlighted and the corrections effected. Thank you. Line 22 and 25 have been noted. Kindly send me a link to your original paper. Thanks. Citation 17 was adopted because the statement was from that work. Thank you. Noted. Thank you. Noted and corrected. Thank you. Line 63 2.3 have been noted and corrected. Line 63 2.3. overlayed colony plates have been supplied. An air sampler would be very preferable as suggested. Could not get one so I used a method which other studies have used to evaluate the falling microbes. Thank you. Sequencing would be preferable but molecular techniques in this part of the country is still at a developmental stage. More emphasis is based on bacterial sequencing. Thank you for the observation. Actually the morning sampling hour was 10 am (peak of work activities) and the evening (6 pm) after work activities. I agree, but the expertise and the equipment is scarce in this part of the country. DNA sequencing haven't gained much grounds as it is targeted more on identification of bacteria. Thank you. Though I anticipate to go molecular if



SDI Review Form 1.6

		the equipment and knowledge on how to use it is made available. Thank you once again.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	<u>Reviewer's comment</u>	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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	Corrected.