

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOB_110259
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Air, Water, Soil, Hand Swabs, and Feeds Quality of Livestock Farms in the Southeast
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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, the study on impact of livestock farms on air, water and soil quality is of considerable importance to scientific community.</p> <p>No. The title is not in line with the work done, especially the microbiological studies. Further, 'Southeast' does not make the geographical area clear. It is advised that the title may be modified as 'Bacterial examination of Air, Water, Soil, Hand Swabs, and Feeds from Livestock Farms in the Southeastern Nigeria'</p> <p>The abstract needs to be written with more care. It can be shorter and precise. Full form of total potential pathogenic bacterial count needs to be mentioned. The concluding statement of the abstract is not convincing as the study does not compare the bacterial load with any standards set up by any relevant commission. Quantitative representation of bacteria must be in terms of CFUs/ml, CFUs/m³ or relevant units.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>The author/s may consider following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comparing the bacterial loads with standards such as European Commission for non-industrial premises. 2. The sampling size with respect to the number of sites for air samples quality, number of hand swabs (number of swabs from each worker), number of sites and instances of water samples collected etc. are not clear. 3. There is no mention of use of aseptic conditions in manuscript. 4. Biochemical characteristics of the isolates should be summarized in the form of a table. 5. Images of the culture plates with countable colonies are desirable. 6. Instead of a graph, a table with details of CFUs, and statistical analysis will provide more clarity. <p>1. The references with respect to the standards of bacterial load may be included. Andualem, Z., Gizaw, Z., Bogale, L. <i>et al.</i> Indoor bacterial load and its correlation to physical indoor air quality parameters in public primary schools. <i>Multidiscip Respir Med</i> 14, 2 (2019). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40248-018-0167-y</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Though, the work is of considerable importance, it needs to be supplemented by a good sampling size, scientifically correct presentation and relevant references.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shrihari Ashok Pingle
Department, University & Country	Sangamner Nagarpalika Arts, D. J. Malpani Commerce, B. N. Sarda Science College, India