



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_47278
Title of the Manuscript:	MICROBIAL ASSESSMENT OF INDOOR AIR QUALITY OF VENTILATION SYSTEMS
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	<p>General Comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The criteria or meaning of "quality" is not defined. 2. The goal of measuring air quality "in home or at work" was not met as the sampling sites do not fall in those two categories, but are sites of occasional air exposure. <p>Specific Comments.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Abstract. Please define "better quality" as that is the goal, yet the phrase is ambiguous. 2. Abstract. As only a supermarket, laboratory, and eatery were sampled, there should be no reference to "at home or at work" Please clearly define the meaning of quality and the sites of exposure. 3. Abstract. Last sentence. "concentrations" is inappropriate for bacteria and fungi, density is used. <p>Introduction</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Paragraph 1. As indoor air is influenced "...by the outdoor air...", why were not outdoor air samples collected and the airborne microflora characterized? 2. Paragraph 1. Please consider that human-associated microorganisms (e.g., Staphylococcus aureus and Streptococcus spp.) contribute to indoor spaces. 3. Paragraph 2. Please define "an acceptable IAQ". 4. Paragraph 2. Last sentence. "increased susceptibility" should be increased exposure and replace "pollutants" with microorganisms. 5. Paragraph 4. Please consider deleting this paragraph as the work does not address energy savings. <p>Materials and Methods</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Experimental Design. With only 2 plates, there is very little power in the collection strategy, raising questions of sensitivity of detection and sample variation. 2. Sampling Procedure. As plates were incubated for only 24 hr, many potential pathogens might not have been detected 3. Ethical Consideration. Insert "to" between communicated and the personnel. <p>results</p> <p>Results</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Paragraph 1. The appearance of Staphylococcus and Streptococcus suggests a human source, rather than outdoor air. A comparison to outdoor air would prove of great value to the study. 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>2. Table 1. Did any possible bacterial colonies get overgrown by fungal colonies? 3. Tables 1, 2, 3, and 4 . Add number of samples and standard deviation to the data. Standard error (Tables 2 and 4) should be on the same line as the average. 4. Paragraph 2. For “average bacteria count” please add number of samples and standard deviation. 5. Paragraph 3. There is no need for text to describe the data in Table 3, so the text can be reduced to simply report the major points. 6. Paragraph 4. The comparisons (“highest”) should be subject to statistical analysis as listed in the Materials and Methods.</p> <p>Discussion</p> <p>1. Paragraph 1. A recapitulation of the Results is unnecessary and the paragraph can be deleted. 2. The Discussion should include a critical analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the experimental approaches. For example, would the media support the growth of all microorganisms, did the number of samples limit the sensitivity of detection, did overgrowth influence the results, 3. Were the requirements of use of the Omeliansky formula met in the study?</p> <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>1. Unnecessary</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>It is not clear whether the owners and people in the collection sites were appropriately advised of the study</p>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Joseph O. Falkinham, III
Department, University & Country	Virginia Tech, USA