

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Microbiology Research Journal International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_83849
Title of the Manuscript:	Microbiological Assessment of Used Face Masks in Port Harcourt Secondary Schools in COVID-19 Era
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.journalmri.com/index.php/MRJI/editorial-policy>

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The manuscript performed microbial analysis of 25 used face masks of children attending different high schools in an area in Nigeria in covid19 era:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The abstract is too long and has many unnecessary details regarding the species found most or least in each school. These details should be saved to the results section only</li> <li>2. The analysis was performed on 25 used masks; with this limited number of samples , the analysis regarding gender and age groups is biased and irrelevant . the number of females to males is 2.5 folds (18 F and 7 M) so you cannot conclude that contamination level was higher in females than males?</li> <li>3. Similarly The analysis regarding age groups is also not correct as the 2 age groups compared are 6 fold higher:( age group12-14 included 3masks only while age group 16-18 contained 18 masks) so you cannot conclude that highest contamination was in age group 16-18</li> <li>4. Tables 2 and 3 should be better removed</li> <li>5. In the Methodology section the time of disposal of the mask for analysis is not mentioned i.e. how many hours after use was the mask examined and was this time unified in all masks?</li> <li>6. Table 1 that includes the individual analysis results of each of the 25 masks is rather confusing in the calculations as it is not matching with the overall results of the analysis Example; regarding E.coli isolates it is listed in 1 mask only while in table 2 and the text it is mentioned to be isolated from 100% of the masks from RMM school which is 5 masks????</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Discussion section is rather abrupt and not informative with no innovation	
<b>Optional/General</b> 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Nevine Sobhy Fam</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Theodor Bilharz Research Institute, Egypt</b>