



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Advances in Microbiology |
| 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) |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| Compulsory REVISION comments | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Are the springs and the river are direct sources for drinking in the site of the study to be judged in comparison to WHO standards of drinking water? Line 25 1st sentence is loose and not adding a point. Can be removed. Line 33, a recent reference is needed. Line 39 What is not absolute? Line 41 Why use WHO (2006). Also, I do not think total coliforms should be zero, may be thermotolerant and E. coli or fecal coliforms. Study area can be at the end of introduction as a rationale for the work and it should be mentioned if these investigated sources are used for drinking or not Data in Table 1 is not needed to be put in a table. Just can be a legend to the map figure. Research design should be at the start of methodology. What is a, b, c and ab in table 2 Tables should show the p value for each site and the way of statistics analysis used Line 128-130 rephrase the sentence Line 132-138 my opinion is to put your interpretation or assumption for differences first which is good and logic then tell who agrees or not and why. Line 151 this is the first time to mention protected and unprotected springs. Where in your work? Line 157-158 sentence not understood how? Line 163-165 sentence not make sense | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Not most people use river water but springs are used by most of the population Line 25 is ok Recent reference added to line 33 The sentence is fine, line 39 Line 41 shows WHO guidelines and is true from the data Fixed Fixed Sample collection should precede research design. I do not agree with this suggestion a, b, c and d are measures of significance and they are explained in the figure legend I think this is addressed in point (9) above. Significant differences in different sampling points have been shown by letters a, b and c. Fixed, now 146-149. Fixed This have now been included in the research design Lines removed Problem fixed, now 178-181 |
| Minor REVISION comments | <p>Line 128 "elsewhere," should be "elsewhere. "</p> <p>Line 154 " out breaks" should be "outbreaks "</p> <p>Line 161 Ofoma <i>et al.</i>, 2005) should be Ofoma <i>et al.</i>, (2005)</p> | Fixed |
| Optional/General comments | <p>Generally a strong rational should be emphasized for the work and to be mentioned in your conclusion to clarify what you added to the reader's knowledge.</p> <p>Some paragraphs need language revision or rephrasing</p> <p>Generally the references should be updated.</p> | fixed |