

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_104542
Title of the Manuscript:	Microbiological Assessment of Indoor Air Quality in Selected Patient Wards at a Tertiary Hospital in Nigeria
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:

(<https://www.journalarrb.com/index.php/ARRB/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, it is as it is speaking an important point in relevance with Nosocomial infections</p> <p>Yes, it is relevant</p> <p>Yes, it is</p> <p>Results are presented only in the form of Table and Graphs. They are not explained.</p> <p>No. Need to be rewritten (Discussion can be renamed as Results and Discussion) As the samples are conducted, the colony forming units must be stated only as CFU and not as CFU/m3. The volume of sampled air is not known, but, authors claim it as Cubic meter.</p> <p>Yes, sufficient references are cited.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Please check the grammatical error.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>(Discussion can be renamed as Results and Discussion)</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>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	N.K. Udaya Prakash
Department, University & Country	Vels Institute of Science, Technology and Advanced Studies, India