

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Pathogen Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPR_96919
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF TOTAL VIABLE BACTERIA COUNTS AND IN SITU CHARACTERISTICS IN DRINKING WATER SOURCES IN SAGBAMA TOWN, BAYELSA STATE, NIGERIA
Type of the Article	Research

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.journalijpr.com/index.php/IJPR/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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The title of the manuscript is very important since drinking water quality problem is a hot issue, now a day, in the world. But the structure and the way it is written are very poor.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the introduction, the research gap is not well mentioned. The author should show what is done and what is not yet done regarding the groundwater and surface water quality of the study area. The objectives of this research should be clearly mentioned since the intention of the research is to fill the research gap in the study area. The introduction should have more clear idea how the research in this paper was selected among several other papers. That is the statement of the problem (the gap is not properly stated). Let the author show the reason why this study was needed. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the methodology doesn't show even when and how the samples were taken, how and why the sampling sites were selected, how sample size was determined, Tables are not formatted Tables 4 and 5 can be merged The results are not even compared with the nations and international water quality standards. <p>Generally, I boldly recommend it to have major revisions for reconsideration.</p> <p>Questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> How the sample size was determined? How many drinking water resources are there in the study area and how samples size was determined to be 30? Can 30 water samples represent the drinking water resources (groundwater and surface water) in the study area? Is one round sampling enough to conclude about the water quality of the study area? Time has a significant effect on the water quality; so, studies considering time variations are very important to give final conclusions. In this study, only one round sampling is done which can affect the conclusion about the water quality status of the study area. Why only the given water quality parameters are considered? 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It has many English and typos errors 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>High English and grammatical errors (throughout the whole section).</p> <p>-Typos and spacing errors. Let the whole section be polished accordingly. This helps for the betterment of the paper.</p> <p>Let the author polish the whole section of the paper and incorporate the aforementioned comments, and answer questions so that it can be reconsidered.</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><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mekuanint Lewoyehu Shferaw
Department, University & Country	Bahir Dar University, Ethiopia