



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Microbiology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_39522
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysis of Fecal Coliform Levels at Watering Points along the Upper Reaches of River Isiukhu in Kakamega County, Kenya
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>ABSTRACT</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are the authors relying on the data available on prevalence of diarrhoea in Kakamega County as a basis for their investigation? If yes, let it be justified and well explained in the introduction</li> <li>References are generally old and not recent; also authors did not include references of recent studies conducted in their country in the text.</li> <li>Authors must reference the methodologies adopted for the estimation of coliforms.</li> <li>The entire reference section must be rewritten</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This study was not based on the diarrhoea data. It was performed because over reliance on river and stream water. We wanted to determine it is clean for human consumption that was our aim.</li> <li>Such studies have not been conducted in Kenya recently, as such, these references are not available, except those that had been carried out earlier.</li> <li>It has been fixed</li> <li>Newer references have been added.</li> </ol>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<b>Introduction</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The section is short, poorly referenced and not adequate.</li> </ol> <b>Materials and Methods</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include the locations, latitude and longitude as well as local basic demography of the area concerned for details</li> <li>Table 1 is not needed and should be removed</li> <li>Authors should give further details on research design</li> </ol> <b>Discussion</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This section is poorly written and must be beefed up too</li> </ol>	<b>Introduction</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New material added and more references as well</li> </ol> <b>Materials and methods</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Location, latitudes and longitudes of Kakamega including its demography was added</li> <li>Table 1 removed as recommended</li> <li>Details on research design have been added.</li> </ol> <b>Discussion</b>
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The article needs to be revised thoroughly by the authors	Fixed