

First Round

RESPONSES TO REVIEWERS' SUGGESTIONS

Reviewer A:	Authors Response
Recommendation: Resubmit for Review 1. Relevance of the title to the content of the article Regular Remarks Should be more concise	Acknowledged. Remarks appropriately addressed
2. Summary: Presents the general idea of the topic, objectives, research methods, results and conclusions, written in an objective and concise manner; and are found according to the maximum number of words per section. Good Remarks Standardize the font type and size throughout the section	Agreed. Done. Done with the font: Calibri and the font size was consistent with 11.
3. Introduction: Presentation of the subject, justification of the problem, objectives, hypotheses and methodological foundation, exposing the subject in an orderly and detailed manner Good	

Remarks	
Homogenize et al	Done (<i>et al.</i> ,)
<p>4. Methodology: Describes the procedure, methods and techniques used in data collection and analysis.</p> <p>Regular</p> <p>Remarks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To guarantee the reproducibility of the experiment, it is important that not only the techniques or methods used be described in the methodology, but also the materials and equipment used. - mL is written in several sections of the document - Why use ciprofloxacin as a positive control? - For the identification of the isolated microorganisms, why were molecular tests not made to have greater certainty? - In the Determination of Population Density Pre- and Post-sterilization section, describe the methodology in prose 	<p>Remarks appropriately addressed.</p> <p>Corrected.</p> <p>Ciprofloxacin® (a broad spectrum antibiotic) was used as positive control because all the test isolates were found to be sensitive to it.</p> <p>Limitation of the study has been stated in the manuscript: Molecular characterization of the test isolates used for the study was not done due to cost.</p> <p>Done.</p>
<p>5. Ethical aspects. Does the manuscript have a paragraph on ethical aspects, where it mentions approval by the ethics committee, informed consent, and strict compliance with research ethics?</p> <p>Yes</p>	Agreed.
6. Results: They are presented adequately	Acknowledged. Remarks appropriately

and it is not redundant with tables or graphs shown.	addressed.
Regular	
Remarks	
Why did the positive control have no effect on Coagulase Negative Staphylococcus when evaluating Sunshine?	Omission in data entry in the table has be rectified.
The title of Figure 4 should be changed to	
-The format of the letter must be homogeneous throughout the document	Done
-The scientific names of bacteria should always appear in italics.	Done
-What control is the one that is graphed?	Done (They are now consistent in italicized format)
-Should the commercial name of the products begin with uppercase or lowercase?	Controls were put up for all the test organisms to show the activity of the neutralizer. For control, 0.1 ml of 0.5 McFarland broth of each test organism was vortex with 0.9 ml of neutralizer in separate tubes then transferred to TSB, as the procedure described with hand sanitizers. Subsequently, all the controls were streaked onto TSA plates.
-What is the difference between the information shown in the tables and in the graphs?	Corrected.
-There are two conclusions in the document	

	<p>Tables 7 & 8 have been deleted to avoid duplication of data.</p> <p>The study assessed both the bacteriological quality and efficacy of two commercial sold hand sanitizers, hence the conclusions.</p>
<p>7. Discussion: They present a level of critical analysis in correspondence with the problem presented. Purposes of the article, scope, support theory and proposed methodological design.</p> <p>Regular</p> <p>Remarks</p> <p>The results are not properly presented and discussed</p>	<p>Remarks have been addressed.</p>
<p>8. Conclusions: Presents the author's inferences and teachings in relation to the investigated topic, it must correspond to the objectives of the study.</p> <p>Regular</p> <p>Remarks</p>	<p>Done.</p>
<p>9. References. Quality of bibliographic references and if they are in accordance with the Vancouver format.</p> <p>Poor</p>	<p>Acknowledged. Remarks well addressed.</p> <p>References have been corrected. It is now in accordance with the Vancouver style)</p>

Remarks	
Citations and references lack the indicated format	Citations and references are now in their indicated format.
10. Redaction. Is the manuscript correctly written? Does it contain any spelling or grammar mistakes?	Agreed. Observation now well addressed.
Needs some language corrections	The language corrections have been implemented.
11. Contributions. What are the main weaknesses of the manuscript and how the author can do to improve it - In the methodology, the reagents and equipment used must be described. - In the results section, do not duplicate information and explain in detail the most significant results. - Discuss the results in an orderly and appropriate manner, provide bibliographic support. - Throughout the document, check the writing of the scientific names of bacteria, that the units are correctly written and that the format of the letter is homogeneous - Place citations and references in the indicated format	<p>Acknowledged. Now appropriately addressed.</p> <p>The reagents and equipment used has been described.</p> <p>These have been considered.</p> <p>Successfully corrected.</p> <p>Done.</p> <p>References have been corrected. It is now in accordance with the Vancouver.</p>
Reviewer B:	Authors Response
Recommendation: Revisions Required	

<p>1. Relevance of the title to the content of the article</p> <p>Regular</p> <p>Remarks</p>	Acknowledged.
<p>2. Summary: Presents the general idea of the topic, objectives, research methods, results and conclusions, written in an objective and concise manner; and are found according to the maximum number of words per section.</p> <p>Good</p> <p>Remarks</p>	Agreed.
<p>3. Introduction: Presentation of the subject, justification of the problem, objectives, hypotheses and methodological foundation, exposing the subject in an orderly and detailed manner</p> <p>Good</p> <p>Remarks</p>	Acknowledged.
<p>4. Methodology: Describes the procedure, methods and techniques used in data collection and analysis.</p> <p>Good</p> <p>Remarks</p>	Acknowledged.
<p>5. Ethical aspects. Does the manuscript have</p>	Disagreed. The manuscript does have a

<p>a paragraph on ethical aspects, where it mentions approval by the ethics committee, informed consent, and strict compliance with research ethics?</p> <p>No</p>	<p>paragraph earmarked for ethical approval, as alluded by Reviewer A.</p>
<p>6. Results: They are presented adequately and it is not redundant with tables or graphs shown.</p> <p>Poor</p> <p>Remarks</p> <p>The photographs must be eliminated, since later on it exposes the sanitizers as A and B anonymously, the names of the commercial brands must be deleted, to avoid legal discussions outside of the notification to the health agencies.</p>	<p>Acknowledged. Remarks well addressed.</p> <p>Photographs have been removed and brand names designated as Brand “A” and “B”, respectively.</p>
<p>7. Discussion: They present a level of critical analysis in correspondence with the problem presented. Purposes of the article, scope, support theory and proposed methodological design.</p> <p>Good</p> <p>Remarks</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>
<p>8. Conclusions: Presents the author's inferences and teachings in relation to the investigated topic, it must correspond to the objectives of the study.</p> <p>Good</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>

Remarks	
9. References. Quality of bibliographic references and if they are in accordance with the Vancouver format. Good Remarks	Acknowledged.
10. Redaction. Is the manuscript correctly written? Does it contain any spelling or grammar mistakes? Acceptable	Acknowledged.
11. Contributions. What are the main weaknesses of the manuscript and how the author can do to improve it A specialist in microbiology should be sought to validate the design and techniques used in the investigation.	Done.

Second Round

RESPONSES TO REVIEWERS' SUGGESTIONS

Reviewer's comments/suggestions	Authors Response
Abstract is too long. It must to be 250 words or less	Abstract has been reduced to 250 words
Citation used for the journal must to be Vancouver.	Vancouver style has been adopted for all citations.
This section (Materials and Methods) is too	Aspects that are well known have been

long. Although it is true that it must be adequately described for an adequate assessment of the research, there are aspects that are well known and can be better summarized.	summarized.
All these statements can be summarized in a single paragraph	Done
Avoid describing situations that are already well known. It is also possible to use the resource of citing a manuscript where the procedures have already been described.	Done
This table can easily be described as text.	Done