

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_97728
Title of the Manuscript:	Microorganisms associated with Barbers Clippers in Rivers State University and its Environs, 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.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy>)

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>In my opinion, this study is relevant to both the lay and scientific community as barbing of hair is mostly undertaken by most men and some females, even children are not left out. Yes the title is appropriate. The abstract needs more details with regards to the findings from the structured-questionnaire. Yes the manuscript is well-structured. Except that no references were given for the experimental procedures carried out. Again the selection criteria for the determination of the sample locations around the university was not explained. It is worth mentioning how many barbing salons are located within and around the university, how many were selected and what yardstick was applied in choosing the study locations. Was it based on frequency of patronage by clients, or other criteria or was it randomly done? Yes the paper is scientifically correct. But there is a missing result. A pretested structured questionnaires was administered to the participants to obtain their information as samples were collected from clippers immediately after each haircut. Demographic data obtained were age and sex, use of personal or public barbing equipment, housing sanitation, occupation and history of any hair disease. The outcome of this questionnaire was neither displayed, nor mentioned and was not discussed. This missing result could be useful in explaining the microbial analysis results. Again, it is worth-knowing what age-groups are at high risk of infection from barbing. Also, could a history of hair disease be a contributory factor to the high percentage of <i>S. aureus</i> which is the most abundant pathogen found in the barbers' tools. These and many more were not answered in the study. The references are inadequate and more should be added.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>No, the write-up needs extensive grammatical corrections. The texts are written in different fonts and sizes. There are several spelling mistakes.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I would advise that the manuscript be corrected; the missing results from the questionnaires included and discussed in comparison to previous studies on this subject. This would greatly improve the content and significance of the study.</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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Johnson-Ajinwo, Okiemute Rosa
Department, University & Country	University of Port Harcourt, Nigeria