



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_48285
Title of the Manuscript:	Incidence of alarming microbial pathogens over Refuse Dump Sites and its 'Harmful Distance' In Port Harcourt, South South Nigeria
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		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>In this paper authors measured the microbial concentration of air around the dump sites using the "sedimentation method" that involved exposing different sterile Petri dishes containing nutrient agar, Mac Conkey agar, and sabauroud dextrose agar to the air for ten minutes. The exposures were carried out at different locations within and around the dump site viz; Top of the dumpsite at different altitude (3ft, 6ft and 9ft above dump surface), 0m, 10m away from the dumpsite, and at the nearest neighbourhood which is about 100m away from the dumpsite. These samplings were carried out to the left and right sides of the dump sites. The samplings were carried out between June and July 2018, so as to compare the microbial load between the dry and wet seasons.</p> <p>Authors concluded that the presence of microbial pathogens such as Escherichia coli, Staphylococcus aureus, Bacillus spp, Klebsiella pneumonia, Salmonella enterica and Aspergillus species, is alarming and of great health concern. The harmful distance exceeds 100m away from the dump site which encroached 30 meters into residential areas.</p> <p>The study is very interesting and manuscript is almost structured properly.</p> <p>Following Explanations are needed-</p> <p>Page 2: 2.MATERIAL AND METHODS is to be replaced as 2. MATERIAL AND METHODOLOGY</p> <p>Page 11: 5.1 CONCLUSIONS is to be replaced as 4.0 CONCLUSIONS and concluding remarks are to be re-written with point wise..</p>	All identified areas have been corrected accordingly.
Optional/General comments	<p>Manuscript is interesting and structured properly, but need to be improvised linguistically.</p> <p><i>The review manuscript is recommended for publication after incorporating above suggestion / comments.</i></p>	It has been taken care of.

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>	