

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_84694
Title of the Manuscript:	Qualitative Physicochemical and Bacteriological Assessment of Water Systems in the University of Eastern Philippines Main Campus
Type of the 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:

(<https://www.journaljamb.com/index.php/JAMB/editorial-policy>)

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	<p>For the introduction, the order of presentation of the subject in the paragraphs is very complex for a more comprehensive interpretation. therefore, it is suggested that the authors reassess the way in which this data is presented, following a more didactic sequence for the reader, such as: 1 importance of water; 2 the constituents; 3 application; 4 quality parameters for a given type of consumption; 5 influence of the presence or absence of microorganism; 6 legislation applied to the parameters; 7 scientific interest in the topic and 8 objective of the study.</p> <p>The text portrays the test of the color parameter in a very simple way, having seen that there are kits for this test that will provide qualitative values for a more efficient screening, since the way of obtaining it presented by the authors is indicative of flaws, since each person is endowed with a degree of evaluation and this can give indications of a false positive or negative of the obtained value. It would be more prudent to carry out a comparison of these assay values with another more significant protocol in the sense of lower probability of errors. and may even be a suggestive of methodology validation.</p> <p>The methodology did not detail the samples as being area 1 a of the tank located in a similar place, as well as the other samples that are exposed in the tables with their respective values presented of their parameters under study.</p> <p>In the item in table 7, the author reports that the color parameter was made following a protocol, whose same parameter reported in the previous tables in this study was from another protocol. One suggestion would be to standardize which protocol to apply for this parameter or justify why in certain samples different protocols were used to evaluate the same parameter.</p> <p>It was possible to observe an absence of simpler didactics for understanding the trials to be evaluated in this study. It would be prudent to reassess the way in which this data is presented with its tables, as it is possible to identify the same parameter repeatedly in tables to demonstrate that these are different samples. a suggestion would be to name all the samples and put the evaluated parameter in the same table and in the discussion text report the meaning of the value obtained as positive or negative for the application that is intended to be implemented.</p> <p>The assay for the determination of bacteria, in the case of the work presented was E.coli, it is suggested that you describe in more detail the type of medium used for the identification of this microorganism, if it was purchased ready which brand, if it was Once everything was done, detail the methodology of how the preparation was carried out and then inoculate the material.</p> <p>In some analyzed parameters, the text reports a citation with standard values to be compared to those obtained as pH, but this same detail is not presented for odor, color and salinity, seen in the writing in the item of table 1 of the results.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Documents related to the protocols used in the trials of this study are cited in the text, originating from BAM of the AOC, however the reference of where it is located so that this study can be reproducible by other groups was not mentioned. Review this quote and present it in the text.</p> <p>Table 2 reports that there were 3 samples, but its content shows 7 samples. It is interesting to</p>	

Review Form 1.6

	reevaluate this writing, which is a little confusing for the reader. For the conclusion of this study, the author does not report any possible solution for the correction of parameters that were presented with values outside the standard, regardless of whether the analyzed location is more indicative for recreation or a source of application for human consumption.	
Optional/General comments	Generally, the title of the work needs to be well-demonstrative of the content that the study presents, in this case in particular, a reassessment for this study would be good, since it is full of private information, the way it was presented can hamper its dissemination due to the omission of more representative information. Regarding the text of the content of table 2, a justification is presented on the properties of sodium and applications, but it does not cite the reference that does justice to this text.	

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:	Maria de Sousa Brito Neta
Department, University & Country	Universidade de Brasilia-UnB, Brazil