

# Review of: "Assessment of Quality, Bacterial Population and Diversity of Irrigation Water in Selected Areas of Minna, Niger State, Nigeria"

Belma Nural Yaman<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Eskisehir Osmangazi University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

## Dear Editor,

This study was too weak to publish in a journal. The orders of methods and results were very irregular. Discussion is missing. I recommended this manuscript is not acceptable.

## Dear Authors,

"Assessment of Quality, Bacterial Population and Diversity of Irrigation Water in Selected Areas of Minna, Niger State, Nigeria," titled study, analyzed the quality, bacterial population, and diversity of irrigation water in Minna, Niger State, during the 2016 cropping season. Three points from four locations were tested, and the results showed that the bacterial population and diversity were significantly influenced by location. Fadikpe had the highest bacterial population and was the least diverse. The water's bacterial population may not be biodegrading, with *B. subtilis* having the highest potential. Chanchaga water had the best quality, but further studies are needed to investigate *B. subtilis*' potential for bioremediation.

I recommend the **below revisions** for this manuscript.

## Abstract

1. The microorganism should be mentioned in this part.

## Introduction

1. **P2:** "90% of all wastewater goes untreated into local rivers and streams (UNEP, 2002)"— the information should be corrected by current literature.
2. Generally, the literature should be updated by recent works of literature.

## Materials and Methods

1. All manuscripts should be controlled in terms of symbols and SI units. For example, CFU ml<sup>1</sup> should be written

instead of CFU<sup>-1</sup> ml.

2. The method's plan should be rearranged to be easy to follow, and some of this part shouldn't include very, very much detail. The authors should avoid.
3. Biochemical tests and colony morphology analyses are very important. However, why did the authors not use molecular identification, and how did they describe the microorganisms?

## Results and Discussion

1. The order of the results should be rearranged.
2. The discussion part should be included in the manuscript.