



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Microbiology Research Journal International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_47836
Title of the Manuscript:	Hand hygiene practices and the effectiveness of hand sanitizers at controlling enteropathogens among the residents of a University community in Osun State Nigeria
Type of the Article	<u>Original Research Article</u>

**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	<p>The methods of the study needs to be amended</p> <p>The study is of great relevance but need to be revised. The authors need to put into consideration the methods used in their research which in turn will affect their results. The method of their bacterial identification is obsolete, more biochemical testing can be employed in our developing country not necessarily molecular identification to validate their identification. Also, there was no clear statistical association shown in the study. More so, the plating medium used, how they arrived at the colony forming unit which needs explanation (the figures presented). The interval of two weeks before other methods of hand washing was done needs to be justified. The time may not be necessary but the activities and the type of bacterial isolates recovered.</p>	<p>The microbiological methods used in the study were further elaborated on in the updated manuscripts and details were provided. Standard microbiological methods were used, particularly in relation to methods of isolating members of the bacterial group of the family Enterobacteriaceae as highlighted in yellow, in the materials and methods section and other relevant portions of the updated manuscript. Duncan's multiple range tests was used in order to statistically determine differences between the treatments. The statistical association is now noted in the results and other relevant sections of the manuscript. The authors concur that the time of sample collection is not really critical information and in fact the "two weeks" information provided in the previous version of the manuscript is rather misleading and has hence been deleted from the updated version of the manuscript.</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> 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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	