

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_88328
Title of the Manuscript:	Bacteriological Assessment and Antibiotic Susceptibility Patterns of Money from Bank Cash Points and Markets in Port Harcourt Metropolis
Type of the Article	Original paper

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 <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>
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<p>EVALUATIONS OF THE MANUSCRIPT ENTITLED "Bacteriological Assessment and Antibiotic Susceptibility Patterns of Money from Bank Cash Points and Markets in Port Harcourt Metropolis"</p> <p>TITLE The title as written creates a misunderstanding for the reader. It suggests that it is about the sensitivity of silver to antibiotics. Proposition : Bacteriological quality of money from the cash registers of banks and markets in the Port Harcourt metropolis and bacterial susceptibility to antibiotics</p> <p>INTRODUCTION In the introduction, the author has remarkably justified the choice and interest of the subject matter. However, no justification is given as to why the banks and markets of the Port Harcourt metropolis were chosen for this study. A paragraph should be opened to that effect</p> <p>DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY AREA A map would be provided to show the study area. Also, the socio-demographic characteristics should be indicated.</p> <p>DATA COLLECTION A total of two hundred and eighty-eight (288) naira notes were collected from the four (4) different locations under hygienic conditions in Port Harcourt Rivers State, and transported to the Department of Microbiology Laboratory, Rivets State University for bacteriological analyses. This section raises some questions. 1- Was the study conducted in six (6) or four (4) locations? 2- Why was a sample of 288 tickets chosen? How was the statistical approach used to arrive at this sample? Was a mathematical formula applied to obtain this sample? How many banknotes were collected per study location? 3- For the transport of the collected banknotes, under what conditions was the transport carried out? What measures were taken in the field to collect the banknotes (gloves, mufflers, physiological solutions or cooler or cardboard for conservation, etc.)? 4- How were the tickets collected in the field? At what time? What was the period of the study? Are there any selection and eligibility criteria for the tickets collected?</p> <p>DATA ANALYSIS Was the bacterial count the only variable considered in the statistical analysis? If not, it would be appropriate to include all variables in the study. What is the specific purpose of the ANOVA? Similarly, what is the purpose of using Duncan's test? When is this test used? Are the samples independent or matched? This should be clarified How were the antibiotic susceptibility data used to determine potential resistance? This section needs to be clarified as there are results for bacterial antibiotic susceptibility in the "Results" section.</p> <p>RESULTS The results as presented by the author do not show their relevance. The pvalues indicating significance or non-significance for the different statistical tests performed should be clearly mentioned in the tables. As a proposal, to be more perceptible, the results can be reorganized as follows:</p>	

Review Form 1.6

	<p>In the banks, it would be sufficient to simply say that no TSS x103, TCBS x103 and TFC x103 bacteria were identified. This is not the case with the bacterial count in the markets for these bacteria. And these values should simply be listed but not tabulated and analyzed accordingly. For THB x106, TCC x104 and THF x103, a table for each type of bacteria and for each study group, i.e. bank and market, would be appropriate. In this way, it would be easy to perceive the evolution of each type of bacteria in the banks as well as in the markets. Statistical tests will allow us to say whether the difference in means is significant for each type of bacteria in the banks and in the markets.</p> <p>Finally, a last table would simultaneously present the total bacterial counts in both banks compared to the markets for THB x106, TCC x104 and THF x103. Statistical analysis would then determine if there was a significant difference in the mean between the banks and the markets for each type of bacteria</p> <p>Figure 1, Tables 7, 8 and 9 may remain.</p> <p>The author presents resistance indices in Table 10. How were these indices calculated? It would be wise to explain this in the Data Processing and Analysis.</p> <p>DISCUSSION</p> <p>The discussion conducted by the author does not reference any limitations of the study. It would be beneficial for the author to point out the limitations of the study and discuss them in light of the sources of potential bias or inaccuracy. The discussion could also address an opening on the generalizability of the study's results</p> <p>OTHER COMMENTS</p> <p>The study does not mention ethical considerations. This is not acceptable for a study of such importance in public health.</p> <p>It would also be appropriate for the author to mention the possible difficulties encountered and the existence or not of a conflict of interest for this study.</p> <p>An acknowledgement section for all individuals or institutions involved in the study and the source of funding would be included.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General 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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Yapi Ellele Aime Marius
Department, University & Country	National Institute of Public Hygiene (INHP), Côte D'ivoire