

REVIEWER'S COMMENTS

	Section	Comment
1	Title	appropriate and in line with body content
2	Authorship	Done as per journal guideline
3	abstract	It is precise. However, the following suggestions can be considered for improvement: (i) the word <i>P. aeruginosa</i> in brackets can be deleted. It is universally and scientifically known that the Genus name of an organism is represented by the first letter of the name, written capital and in italics, after appearing first in a document (ii) second sentence gives the findings/ observation. before. The authors ought to have briefly explained the methodology first.
4	Introduction	(i) Too long. can be divided into two; 'Background' and literature review' (ii) paragraph 1 is two in one. The next paragraph should start with line 65 (Patuletin.....) (iii) paragraph 2 (starting with line 71) and 5 (starting with line 94) are all about <i>P. aeruginosa</i> . They should follow each other. (iv) line 78 the word bacteriumcan is two words- separate (v) replace ' were so inspiring' with 'triggered investigation of' or 'informed investigation of'
5	Materials and methods	The procedures are clear. however; - (i) delete 'we' on line 164 under 2.5 Bio-dimensional Assays to read 'To compare..... the reduced subspace, they were merged, aligned, a new C matrix created and projections plotted'. (ii) line 182, broth microdilution technique – capitalise each word (iii) In line 179, The sub-title 2.7. Determination--- should be in a stand-alone line as is the case for all titles and subtitles (iv) line 183 ref. in brackets (Patel 2015) but sentence has 'by patel et. al. (confusing). alternatively delete 'as outlined by Patel et. al in 2015 and insert citation to avoid double referencing (v) line 184, delete 'to briefly summarise the procedure'. Give complete procedure for reproducibility (vi) line 193 and 211, delete 'The ability of <i>P. aeruginosa</i> to form biofilms was assessed as follows & The estimation of pyocyanin was performed as follows:' this is not a step in the procedures
6	Statistical analysis	- Satisfactory and sufficient to inform discussion and conclusion
7	Results and discussion	- good
8	Conclusion	Well drawn
9	References	- more than enough. If the authors can be advised to use most recent and expunge relatively old references to avoid making the paper 'heavy' as a result of so many references. (between 20 – 30 references is recommendable
General comments		
	Language and grammar	- greatly improved after first review
	Figures	- clear, readable
	Paragraphs / lines	- Spacing is not uniform