



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	2015_BMRJ_16162
Title of the Manuscript:	Detection of Indicator Organisms in Drinking Water by Membrane Filtration Method in Open Defaecation Free VDCs of Kaski District, Nepal
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:

(<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 <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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The paper shows an interesting case study regarded the quality of water supply in Nepal. The paper is well write, the steps and results are well presented. Table 2 shows a high risk to people who drink this water and an important information regarded public health and this must to be highlighted in the article. 1. The authors should be insert information regarded the water treatment (if it exists) and insert this in the context of the introduction. 2. The conclusions should be focus in the aim of the paper: the water quality! 3. The information related to disinfection, distribution, sources of contamination must to be displaced for results and discussion. 4. Actually, the phrase regarded the absence of disinfection must to be highlighted because this is the great cause for the presence of TC and FC in the water.	1. 'Chlorine désinfection trématent was not done in both Bharatpokhari and Kalika VDC. The water bodies used for drinking purpose in Bharatpokhari and Kalika VDC are heavily contaminated with total and fecal coliform bacteria even though those VDCs have been declared ODF' included in introduction chapter 2. Conclusion re-structured accordant to reviewer suggestions. 3. Disinfection, distribution, sources of contamination included in discussion
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. Captions of Fig. 1 and 2 are too small. 2. I prefer clear captions of Figures 3-8 and abbreviations must to be avoided. TC, FC, VDC, please replace for the Total Coliforms, ... 3. After Figure 5: ..." According to the data presented in figure...". Please ensure the Figure you are referring (fig. 5, 6, 8?) 4. Figure 9 shows 100% of contamination. This figure can be removed and this information described in	1. Enlarged the fig.1 and 2 as reviewer suggestion. 2. Correction is made as reviewer suggestion. 3. Corrected as reviewer suggestion. 4. Figure 9 shows 100% of contamination is removed as reviewer suggestion. 5. Thank you for your suggestion. Result of this study is great health alert to the authority of VDC so I find it more significant to highlight



SDI Review Form 1.6

	the text. 5. Maybe the item "5. Recommendation" must to be replaced to Results and Discussion because these topics focused in the main problem for heightening the water quality.	it on separate heading for easy marking.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The paper shows an interesting study, showing the lack of care with water supply.	