



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Microbiology Research Journal International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_50131
Title of the Manuscript:	EPIDEMIOLOGICAL STUDIES OF WATERBORNE DISEASES IN RELATION TO BACTERIOLOGICAL QUALITY OF WATER
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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 .English language editing is required. Grammatical corrections &amp; thorough revision of the manuscript by an independent person for better readability is strongly recommended.</li> <li>2. Please make clear about your study design. Is it cross-sectional or retrospective or experimental? How do you relate all these three study in your single paper?</li> <li>3. When was the sample collected? Morning, evening or day?</li> <li>4. How was the sample carried to labrotary?</li> <li>5. ANOVA test is not performed as mentioned in methodology part.</li> <li>6. Do not use other's version in your manuscript directly. Rewording should be done before using others intellectual property.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Grammar checked</li> <li>2. The study can retrospective and cross-sectional design as both designs deal with a secondary data. The experimental design conducted in this study was laboratory examination of water in which an experiment was set up throughout the period of analysis.</li> <li>3. All samples were collected in the morning.</li> <li>4. We explain this in our methodology</li> <li>5. We performed ANOVA the result had been reported (page 9 line 254)</li> <li>6. There is no direct use of other's version in the manuscript. All information that we used were fully acknowledged</li> </ol>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Write all the abbreviations in capital letter enclosed with brackets.</li> <li>2. American Public Health Association (APHA). <i>Standard Methods for the Examination of Water and Waste Water</i>. American Workers Association Water Environment Federation Edited by Arnold E. Greenberg, Lenore S. Clesceri, and Andrew D. E., 1992. APHA 1015 Fifteenth Street, NW Washington, Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water 200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20460 EPA 816-K-02- 003. 9-53.  This Reference is quite old. It would be better if you use new reference.</li> <li>3. Introduction part is too long and boring. Make it brief and specific. Better advised to use short paragraphs.</li> <li>4. Check the spelling of diarrhoea. It is different in different places.</li> <li>5. uniform font, font size and spacing throughout the manuscript is strongly recommended.</li> <li>6. Table 2 and table 1 should be merged together.</li> <li>7. Source of funding should be included in the nmanuscript.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Accepted</li> <li>2. The reference is 2005</li> <li>3. For Introduction a comprehensive explanation and literature is need to describe the significance of our study</li> <li>6.Table 1 and 2 contained different information as such need to be explained separately</li> <li>7.Has been reported</li> </ol>
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>While going through the paper I found that this manuscript has been written as the form of academic research thesis. Please make it more brief, precise and beautiful.</p>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 2:**

	<u>Reviewer's comment</u>	<u>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)</u>
<u>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	
<u>If plagiarism is suspected, please provide related proofs or web links.</u>	<u>No, but the sentences required to be rephrased and reworded before using it, mainly in introduction and discussion part.</u>	The