



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJAST_6965
Title of the Manuscript:	BACTERIOLOGICAL AND PHYSICOCHEMICAL QUALITY OF HAND-DUG WELL WATER USED FOR DRINKING AND DOMESTIC PURPOSES IN DARETA VILLAGE, ANKA, NIGERIA
Type of the Article	Research 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. Abstract – include more information about the article than the text; 2. Introduction – the author explain about the importance the subject, is not short or long. 3. Methods –where are wells? which the distance between the wells? Why did you choose the method of enrichment? Why did you choose the MPN and lactose broth? 4. Results – The tables and figures need modifications. The table 2 is very confused because put in same column <i>Escheria coli</i> H₂S positive and negative. Don't show the Gram test results. 5. Discussion – Began the discussion with TDS but the results others physicochemical parameters. Needs more discussion about the results.	1. It has been corrected and highlighted. 3. The wells have been included, but the distance between wells was not considered in this work, but settlements in this village are not sparse. This method of enrichment was chosen to increase recovery of Salmonellae Pseudomonas and <i>E. coli</i> from environmental samples. Thus it is important for growing enterobacteria and Pseudomonas. MPN and lactose broth were chosen to determine total coliform count in the sample. 4. It has been corrected.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. Line 17: The range is 23×10^2-110×10^4cfu/ml or Table 1 33×10^2-110×10^4cfu/ml 2. Table 2 – each microorganism in one line	1.Is corrected 2. Is also corrected
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I think the subject is very importance for the region but the article need added more test to confirm the <i>Escherichia coli</i> isolated is pathogen. If the wells are close the waste, confirm the contamination.	