



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_48118
Title of the Manuscript:	A study of the microflora of air environment of rooms sprayed with different aerosols
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		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>The paper has many English mistakes, so needs to be English review before submission. Please supply all chemical structures of chemical insecticides you used. And describe in chemical name, not in trade name.</p> <p>Individual</p> <p>Line 40-43 this is because the difference of human being between bedroom and bathroom. Please clarify that the origin of pollutant is human being.</p> <p>Line 45-49 According to our research, we can estimate the number of airborne microcosms of 10-100 CFU/m³ at dialysis room sampled by air sampler, not by settling method as you used in your experiment. This method is not a quantitative method, but quality method effected by air.</p> <p>Line 48 How do the authors count 105 - 106 CFU/m³ by settling method because 105-106 CFU/plate will be overlapped, so it is hard to count correctly.</p> <p>Line 50 As mentioned in advance 80 CFU/m³ is so and so, but as fungi it is somewhat greater than the reported count.</p> <p>Line 52 104 CFU/m³ is much higher than reported numbers including our report. The cited papers are by air samplers or settling method. Which?</p> <p>Line 56-60 IOQ is lower than outdoor may differ depending on the environment tested. So, if the environment is clean, it may be no significant difference.</p> <p>Line 113 What does it mean sixteen?</p> <p>Line 120-123 Please explain you use 70% alcohol and 95% individually, so why? UV at what wavelength 265 nm? Please clarify. And 2h by UV is validated to be sterilized and be confirmed incubation by what sorts of microorganisms?</p> <p>Line 125 ascetically changes to aseptically</p> <p>Line 126 What rational of 10 min, please supply validation data to support 10 min is sufficient.</p> <p>Line 127 You prepared culture medium by your self, so can you validate the performance difference among lot to lot. Lot to lot difference is significant by our research.</p> <p>Line 141-143 37 oC for 24 h, 28 oC for 72h and 37 oC for 24 h are validated? Culture period is essential to incubate the damaged icroorganisms. The airborne microorganisms are damaged, so required rather longer period to recover and growth. Are these period enough the damaged airborne micro organisms?</p> <p>Line 150 and 160 Please add identification methods using RNA sequence analysis in addition to biochemical analysis.</p> <p>Line 187 inhibit to disinfect</p> <p>Line 189 Please discuss this phenomenon.</p> <p>Line 190-192 Does this mean that the cultivation validation or selection of culture medium is wrong?</p> <p>Page 9-10 These studies should be done as a validation study of sterilization ability of</p>	<p>Counting of the plates was done with colony counter and the plate were divided into quadrants before counting for easy counting of the colonies</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>insecticides used.</p> <p>Line 216-217 This means <i>S. aureus</i>, <i>A. niger</i>, <i>A. flavus</i> are hard to disinfection by insecticides you used, so further studies are needed for seeking for more insecticides to disinfect completely.</p> <p>Page 11-12 The lines discussing about disease are deleted because this paper is not review article and discussion should be limited to discuss only based on results data.</p> <p>Page 12 reported—— should cite the paper.</p> <p>Page 13 from the report, please cite paper.</p> <p>Page 13 1st line and 4th which was not present initially.</p> <p>Please discuss, as I mentioned in advance, this phenomenon. Does this fail to validate sorts of culture medium? <i>Micrococcus</i> spp do not cultivate initially, but later cultivate, how do you explain this phenomenon.</p> <p>Page 14 Please discuss that microbial communities observed in indoor air were closely related with those in outdoor, air, and changes in microbial commodities in outdoor air were mirrored by changes in indoor air, Please discuss this statement.</p> <p>Page 14 Lines 2 from the bottom, outdoor air might exert a stronger influence, If so this experience should re-examine to avoid outdoor air effect.</p> <p>Page 15 it is well known that, In Tokyo, Japan it is not well known——.</p> <p>In Discussion, the description on the comparison of the strength of insecticides should be described in Result, not Discussion. You should combine Result and Discussion and several phenomena which hard to understand should describe in the Discussion section. In your original, both Result and Discussion is Result.</p> <p>Page 16 Human resources. It is well known the arbor and the fall microorganisms are from humans, so it is not the first finding of you. Airborne micro organisms and particles are also well known the origin of several diseases, so it is not your findings.</p> <p>Name of microorganisms in Tables and Figures are in italic.</p>	<p>Line 113 was supposed to be eight not sixteen?</p> <p>Line 120-123 was supposed to be 95% alcohol and not 70%</p> <p>The purpose of using UV light was to surface sterilize the inoculating chamber prior to inoculation. As stated by one of the reviewers to remove all the step by steps of the methodology, all the steps has been removed only the analysis was conducted according to the standard procedure.</p> <p>Culture media were prepared aseptically according to standard procedures of Olutiola et al. (1991).</p> <p>Some microorganisms that were not present in the room before spraying but later were present might be as a result of their occurrence in the aerosols used. Note that the aerosols are not sterile, their could be some microorganisms that were introduced from the aerosols into the room</p> <p>Corrections effected</p>
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	