



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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	This manuscript requires extensive revision involving correction of grammar, spelling, typographical and formatting errors before it is suitable for publication. The author(s) have not complied with journal format. I have made some corrections as examples, but it is the authors' responsibility to ensure that all similar corrections are addressed in the manuscript. According to journal format, the text of the manuscript should be in single column format all in bold face. The text can also be divided into numbered sections starting from Introduction with section 1. The headings and subheadings should be so numbered for a more organized arrangement. The Results should be clearly described in concise manner with figures and tables mentioned in parenthesis for better understanding. The authors have merely presented tables and figures without first presenting results in text/concise manner. Page 1: lines 9-23. The journal format for abstract is as a structured pattern with the following six different subheadings: Aims, Study design, Place and Duration of Study, Methodology, Results, Conclusion. Authors have not followed this format for abstract. Page1: line 16. The full form of the abbreviation – TDS should be given at first use thus: Total dissolved solids	Extensive revision has been made on this manuscript; the grammar, spelling and the typographical errors has been corrected. It has been corrected. The results are presented alongside with the discussion. The journal format of the abstract has now been followed and restructured. It's been corrected.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	(TDS) Page 1: line 16. Insert space between 60-380 and mg/ml Page 1: line 20. Insert "in" between <i>Escherichia coli</i> and water Page 1: line 24. Delete "and" and replace with "," Page 2: line 32. The reference citation should be re-written, correctly, thus [1,2,3] Page 2: line 33. The reference citation should be re-written, correctly, thus [4,5] Page 2: line 36. Insert hyphen "-" between "diseases" and "producing" Page 2: line 44-45. Check the statement for correctness ".....and human activities more especially children [3,9]. Page 2: line 57. Insert "[" before 14 Page 2: line 64-65. The reference citation should be re-written, correctly, thus [16,17] Page 3: line 70. Insert "in" between village and Zamfara Page 3: line 90. Insert space between 9 and ml thus 9 ml Page 3: line 92. Rewrite 24 hours as 24 h Page 5: line 125, Table 1. The acronym for hydrogen ion concentration should be pH and not p^H Problems with References! -References should rather be numbered on the list in the order in which they were cited in manuscript -Journal abbreviations as found in NCBI databases should rather be used instead of being in full forms. For instance, Research Journal of Microbiology should be rather be Res J Microbiol -Page range format for references should rather be in the form 142-45 instead of 142-145; 134-43 instead of 134-143.	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Authors need to go through the journal guidelines/ requirements in order to bring the manuscript to a form suitable for publication	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Author(s) need to further discuss the results in line with results of similar works carried out by other researchers in literatures. The author(s) need to go through the whole manuscript Which requires a major revision in order to correct the numerous formatting, typographical, grammatical errors in it before it can be suitable for publication.	