



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_50131
Title of the Manuscript:	EPIDEMOLOGICAL 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

	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>There is a general lack of coherence in the manuscript. The manuscript has been written without care.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is no logic in the citation of References. How are the references organized? In alphabetical order? In the order of appearance in the text? Do they meet the requirements of the Journal? The names of some journals are abbreviated, some are not, some have parts abbreviated and some not abbreviated, some are written in italics, some are not... It happens the same with the names of authors (with/without dots, with/without "and" or &. Nafi'u Abdulkadir is a different author than Abdulkadir Nafi'u? - When has been collected the water that is analysed for the presence of <i>Escherichia coli</i>? (the name of the bacteria, by the way, has to be ALWAYS written in italics)? During the time of the study of waterborne diseases? Before? After? In which month of the year? Knowing this is absolutely necessary. - Authors say to analyse water for the presence of <i>E. coli</i> by the Most Probable Number Method, but when they talk about results they say cfu/ml. This way of expressing results is not correct for the MPN technique. - The Introduction and the Discussion are repetitive. - Does "wbd" stand for "water borne disease"? If so, why can one see wbd, WBD, WDB... along the manuscript? Moreover, it should be indicated the first time it is used. - In the figures, why do you say "spatial" distribution? There is no mention to the space/place of the diseases. - There are different formats along the manuscript. The format must be uniform. - The language is stilted. For example, lines 35, 66 (What has "pasteurization" to do with animal grazing?), 105, 225, etc. Grammar, orthography and conjugation have to be thoroughly reviewed. <p>The manuscript (and the investigation itself) seems to be a first draft of a student, which has not been corrected by a senior researcher.</p>	<p>The references are organized according to Journal guidelines</p> <p>All journal name and bacteria name have been italicized.</p> <p>The water samples were collected in the morning. The selection of the village for sampling was determined by the number of waterborne diseases found in the area. Throughout the rainy and dry seasons.</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		



PART 2:

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