



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_9315
Title of the Manuscript:	Do You Know Your Sh*t? Students' Awareness, Attitude, and Perception about Current and Relevant Events in Microbiology
Type of the Article	Microbiology education

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. There are no statistical methods used to compare groups. A test of proportions or a simple chi-squared test would allow the authors to say responses were significantly different. 2. Was any question included, to test consistency of student responses in the survey? 3. There are numerous statements made that are not supported by data. For example, page 5-6, lines 168-173. "Exploring unusual or contemporary topics (or "New Worlds") like fecal transplant can stimulate the minds of many students, and motivate students to invest time and energy in their own learning [7].<u>Our data supports this statement.</u> Roughly 80% of students in each group showed interest in taking a microbiology class after completing the survey." How does the data support this? Reading Figure 5 only 20.9% of the non-micro students would take a micro class not 40%. Did the survey begin with a question about the student's likelihood of taking a micro class? The study design, as described in this manuscript, does not allow the authors to draw the conclusions they make. Nor is data supplied that would support their statements.	Since our data is qualitative, we are unable to run a chi-squared test. --"Our data support this statement" has been replaced with a suggestion from reviewer 1. --We stated "roughly 80%" because we had included both "yes" and "maybe" answers. With your comments, we have stated an explanation in the manuscript.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Page 1, line 24, ROFESSOR should be "PROFESSOR	In line 24: Missing P has been added. One of the reviewers has asked us to change the



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Page 5, line 142. Sentence beginning "The knowledge... "doesn't make sense.	word PROFESSOR in small letter. I leave the decision with the editor. In line 142: We have deleted this sentence.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	While this reviewer agrees with many of the general conclusions stated, these conclusions are the authors' opinion and not firmly supported by data. The manuscript could be re-submitted with an expanded methods section, explaining the survey and how the results were analyzed. This, plus inclusion of additional data would greatly increase the likelihood this reviewers would recommending acceptance for publication.	A table has been provided to include the survey, and a short paragraph has been added to expand the method section. Additional data has been added to the conclusion.