

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">South Asian Journal of Research in Microbiology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJRM_127283
Title of the Manuscript:	ISOLATION OF BACTERIA AND FUNGI FROM THE DROPPINGS OF WESTERN HOUSE MARTIN (Delichon urbicum) IN ELELE, NIGERIA.
Type of the Article	

**General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

**Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>  
Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is of significant importance to the scientific community as it explores the largely uncharted microbial diversity associated with the droppings of the Western House Martin. By identifying bacteria and fungi from these bird droppings, the study bridges a critical gap in understanding the potential ecological roles and health implications of avian-associated microorganisms. I appreciate this manuscript because it combines ecological, public health, and microbiological perspectives to highlight the dual role of these microbes as both potential threats and contributors to ecosystem balance. The innovative, non-invasive methods for sample collection and the detailed analysis of microbial isolates further add to the study's merit, making it a valuable reference for future research.	Noted
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title, "Isolation of Bacteria and Fungi from the Droppings of Western House Martin ( <i>Delichon urbicum</i> ) in Elele, Nigeria," is clear and descriptive. It provides information about the study's focus (microbial isolation), subject (Western House Martin droppings), and location (Elele, Nigeria). However, it could be slightly refined to make it more engaging or emphasize its relevance to ecology and public health. Suggested alternate title is: "Pathogenic and Beneficial Microorganisms in Western House Martin Droppings: Ecological and Public Health Perspectives".	I sincerely appreciate your suggestion of an alternative topic; however I humble chose to retain the topic because it clearly describe the location of the study.
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract provides a good overview of the study, including its aim, methodology, results, and implications. However, it could benefit from improved clarity and organization. Additionally, some points are mentioned but not elaborated upon adequately, while others could be refined or removed for conciseness. Suggestions for Improvement: <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>The abstract currently mentions the microbial genera and prevalence rates but lacks emphasis on the broader implications of these findings, such as their potential risks to human health or contributions to ecological knowledge. Highlighting these aspects would improve its comprehensiveness.</li><li>The mention of the p-value being "not significant" is not adequately contextualized. If this is critical, clarify its relevance or omit it to avoid confusion.</li><li>While the methodology is detailed, some specifics (e.g., the exact sites sampled and storage details) could be summarized more briefly to avoid clutter. Focus on unique aspects, like the non-invasive fecal collection method.</li><li>Recommendations like "disinfection of areas concentrated with bird droppings" could be linked more explicitly to the findings for better coherence</li></ol>	The broader impact of the findings would be improved on the abstract as recommended.  Clarity would be provided on significance or non-significance of p values in the abstract.  The methodology on abstract will be improved.  The point made on recommendation will also be address.
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript appears to have a logical structure with standard sections such as Abstract, Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results and Discussion, and Conclusion. However, there is room for refinement to ensure clarity, logical flow, and adherence to scientific writing standards. Here are four points to consider: <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>While the introduction effectively sets the context, it might need to focus more on the knowledge gap and the study's specific contribution. The general biology and behavior of the Western House Martin could be condensed.</li><li>Separate Results and Discussion. While combining these can be efficient, separating them may provide clearer presentation and interpretation of findings.</li><li>Use tables and figures strategically to avoid redundant text (e.g., describing numerical results already presented in tables).</li><li>As far as Conclusion section is concerned, it appropriately summarizes findings, but should highlight future research directions more explicitly.</li></ol>	The introduction would be improved.  The SDI paper template combines Result and Discussion together.  Adjustments would be made to avoid redundant text.  Future research direction would be highlighted in the conclusions
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript demonstrates scientific correctness by employing well-established microbiological techniques such as culture-based methods, Gram staining, and biochemical testing for the identification of bacterial and fungal isolates. The study's methodology is robust, using non-invasive sample collection to ensure ethical considerations and minimize environmental disruption. Additionally, the manuscript provides comprehensive data on the prevalence of identified microorganisms, supporting its findings with appropriate statistical analyses. The detailed discussion contextualizes the results within the existing literature, highlighting both similarities and unique contributions, making the	I'm encouraged

Review Form 3

	study technically sound and scientifically credible.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b> -	The manuscript includes references to a mix of recent and older studies, demonstrating a connection to established knowledge while incorporating newer findings. However, to ensure the references are comprehensive and current, a few aspects could be evaluated and improved like adding references to research conducted in similar ecological contexts (e.g., tropical regions or migratory bird microbiology in Africa) could provide stronger contextual support. Since the manuscript notes the absence of molecular techniques like PCR for species confirmation, including references to studies using these methods would be beneficial.	Noted
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments  <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The language of the manuscript is generally clear and conveys the intended scientific messages. However, there are areas where improvements can be made to ensure the language meets the standards for scholarly communication. Some sentences are lengthy or awkwardly structured, which can affect readability. For instance: "Samples are collected by easy-to-build box for a noninvasive fecal collection method..." can be rephrased for clarity as: "Samples were collected using a simple, non-invasive fecal collection method involving a custom-built box...". I have observed that the manuscript alternates between past and present tense. Scientific papers typically describe methods and results in the past tense. Additionally, some sections, especially the methods and results, contain redundant information that can be streamlined. Last but not least, it is important to highlight that a few phrases lack academic polish. For example: "Recommendation includes proper food handling among students and pilgrims..." can be refined as: "It is recommended to implement proper food handling practices and enhance sanitation measures for students and pilgrims..."	Noted
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

PART 2:

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	