Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JAMB_54412**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Distribution and Antibiotic Sensitivity Patterns of Faecal Bacteria from Underground Faecal Storage Cisterns in Ondo State.**
Type of the Article	**Original Research Paper**

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	**1. The abstract lacks conclusion and also background of the study. To me the abstract is a summary that include background, aim, methodology, results and conclusion.** **2. The choice of key words needs revisit.** **3. Check the spellings on 2.2 Collection of Samples of icepack** **4. It is also good to put sterility checks of your media 2.3 Preparation and Sterilization of Agar** **5. Your document omitted to tell us how did you isolated all your identified bacteria. You only talk about media preparation then enumeration and biochemical tests. You should describe the methods e.g., it's difficult to identify salmonella species without first enrich it in a selective broth such as selenite, Rappaport vasiliadis.** **6. The recommended media for total viable bacteria count is plate count agar even if nutrient agar is a general purpose media.** **7. The recommended incubation time for bacterial enumeration is 48-72 hours at a lower temperature of 25-30 degrees Celsius.** **8. Is your methods validated** **9. On 2.4 Enumeration and Agar-Dependent Isolation please correct the spellings of agar nor agal** **10. Separation of these two 2.4 Enumeration and Agar-Dependent Isolation different procedures it's good for better tracking.** **11. Looking at your bacteria you identified and the few biochemical tests you did on 2.5 Biochemical Characterization, it will be not reliable to say it's this certain bacterial species as there are a lot of bacteria species with similar colony morphology and biochemical characteristics. It was better if you combine these with a battery of sugars such as inulin, inositol, fructose, sucrose, rhaminose, raffinose etc or buy specific API Kit such as API 20E.** **12. Clearly indicate which biochemical was done for each bacteria isolate. For instance I am not seeing any Staphylococcus species in your results why performing coagulase test because coagulase test differentiate pathogenic staphylococcus species from non-pathogen.** **13. "Using Kirby-Bauer method, colonies from overnight culture of bacterial isolate, was aseptically picked and inoculated into test tube containing peptone water that had been autoclaved after it was prepared according to manufacturer's specification. The inoculated test tube was then incubated in a bacteriological incubator at 370C for about 18hours". This is confusing and so you have 2 days of performing AST. The 18hour incubated peptone bacteria suspension will be more than 0.5 McFarland. You can use peptone and incubate it for 2hours or you use 85% saline water where you pick 2-3 colonies and emulsify and compare the turbidity with your standard. The amount of inoculum affects your AST interpretations. Please follow standardised procedures.** **14. Your methodology is not in a chronological format. Other scientists cannot follow what you have documented in your procedures because you are mixing issues. I would advise to start with media preparation followed by standardization of the inoculum, then streaking of the inoculum on the agar plates, incubation, reading of results and interpretation of the results including the breakpoints for each bacteria and antibiotic and the source.** **15. On Table 2 at least add n/N (%) for easy understanding** **16. On Table 1, if you still have the isolates perform more biochemical tests and**	All the corrections suggested by the reviewer have been thoroughly revised and corrected

	sugar fermentation if you do not have API 20E and API 20N Kits. **17. On Figure 2, it is crowded and what is the purpose it is serving there. Are worried about zone of inhibition primary data or we are worried about resistance or susceptibility of the tested organism.** **18. Table 3 not necessary but as for me I think thus where you should show the breakpoints used and the source either CLIS or WHONET (still not yet validated)** **19. "And they can be transmitted to human by formite, animal vectors, and water". Don't base your conclusion on assumptions but with what your data supports. Revisit**	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General 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)*	