

The *South African Journal of Science* follows a double-anonymous peer review model but encourages Reviewers and Authors to publish their anonymised review reports and response letters, respectively, as supplementary files after manuscript review and acceptance. For more information, see [Publishing peer review reports](#).

Peer review history for:

Tshubwana RP, Gomes C, Van Coller J, Regnier TJC. Microbiological growth analysis on a 275 kv transmission line composite insulator in South Africa. *S Afr J Sci.* 2024;120(1/2), Art. #15629.

<https://doi.org/10.17159/sajs.2024/15629>

HOW TO CITE:

Microbiological growth analysis on a 275 kv transmission line composite insulator in South Africa [peer review history]. *S Afr J Sci.* 2024;120(1/2), Art. #15629. <https://doi.org/10.17159/sajs.2024/15629/peerreview>

Reviewer A: Round 1

Recommendation: Accept submission

Does the review fall within the scope of SAJS?

Yes

Is the review written in a style suitable for a non-specialist and is it of wider than only specialist interest?

Yes

Do the Title and Abstract clearly and accurately reflect the content of the review?

Yes

Does the review provide a significantly novel perspective or significant recent advances in the field?

Yes

Is the objective of the review concisely stated?

Yes

Is appropriate and adequate reference made to other work in the field?

Yes

Do current debates and points of contention receive appropriate coverage?

Not applicable

Are gaps in the literature adequately identified?

Not applicable

Does the review provide direction for future research?

Yes

Is the methodology and statistical treatment appropriate?

Yes

Are the interpretations and recommendations aligned with the objective?

Yes

Please rate the manuscript on overall contribution to the field

Good

Please rate the manuscript on language, grammar and tone

Average

Is the manuscript concise and free of repetition and redundancies?

Yes

Is the supplementary material relevant and separated appropriately from the main document?

Yes

Please rate the manuscript on overall quality

Average

If accepted, would you recommend that the article receives priority publication?

Yes

Are you willing to review a revision of this manuscript?

Yes

Comments to the Author:

Line no 8: The authors should clarify this statement in the abstract "Although no yeast or algae were found on the insulators, two major filamentous fungi identified as *Curvularia* sp and *Aspergillus* sp were isolated". Does it mean the two fungi were identified on the two insulators?

Line no 9: The authors should clarify this statement in the abstract, because the following statement contradicts the previous one. " The absence of algae could be attributed to the weather pattern of the two locations where the insulators were placed during their use as part of the network". Is it the absence or presence?

Line no 26: "... especially on matrices ...". What the authors meant by matrices is not clear.

Line no 30: "Such colonization by algae was also green algae growth was reported". This statement is not clear.

Line no 102: The reviewer is of the opinion that the authors should describe the climatic conditions of the sites of the sample insulators.

Line no 125: The reviewer is of the opinion that, it is not necessary to state the company where the primer were purchased from.

Line no 137: The authors should ensure that tables are not split across pages. Table 1 and Table 2 should be reformatted.

Line no 150: The reviewer is of the opinion that, the authors should reformat the in-text citation in " In their study [11-14] on the potential".

Line no 171: What the authors mean by "Austral Africa" is not clear.

Author response to Reviewer A: Round 1

Line no 8: The authors should clarify this statement in the abstract "Although no yeast or algae were found on the insulators, two major filamentous fungi identified as *Curvularia* sp and *Aspergillus* sp were isolated". Does it mean the two fungi were identified on the two insulators?

AUTHOR: Algae and fungi are two different types of microorganisms.

Line no 9: The authors should clarify this statement in the abstract because the following statement contradicts the previous one. " The absence of algae could be attributed to the weather pattern of the two locations where the insulators were placed during their use as part of the network". Is it the absence or presence?

AUTHOR: The statement was addressed.

Line no 26: "... especially on matrices ...". What the authors meant by matrices is not clear.

AUTHOR: Matrices.....refereeing to the environment in which biological colonisation develops

Line no 30: "Such colonization by algae was also green algae growth was reported". This statement is not clear.

AUTHOR: The statement was revised to be meaningful.

Line no 102: The reviewer is of the opinion that the authors should describe the climatic conditions of the sites of the sample insulators.

AUTHOR: Addressed as suggested.

Line no 125: The reviewer is of the opinion that it is not necessary to state the company where the primer was purchased from.

AUTHOR: Addressed, Eskom

Line no 137: The authors should ensure that tables are not split across pages. Table 1 and Table 2 should be reformatted.

AUTHOR: Corrected as suggested.

Line no 150: The reviewer is of the opinion that the authors should reformat the in-text citation in " In their study [11-14] on the potential".

AUTHOR: Corrected.

Line no 171: What the authors mean by "Austral Africa" is not clear.

AUTHOR: It was addressed; as "South Africa".

Reviewer A: Round 2

Recommendation: Accept submission

Does the review fall within the scope of SAJS?

Yes

Is the review written in a style suitable for a non-specialist and is it of wider than only specialist interest?

Yes

Do the Title and Abstract clearly and accurately reflect the content of the review?

Yes

Does the review provide a significantly novel perspective or significant recent advances in the field?

Yes

Is the objective of the review concisely stated?

Yes

Is appropriate and adequate reference made to other work in the field?

Yes

Do current debates and points of contention receive appropriate coverage?

Yes

Are gaps in the literature adequately identified?

Yes

Does the review provide direction for future research?

Yes

Is the methodology and statistical treatment appropriate?

Yes

Are the interpretations and recommendations aligned with the objective?

Yes

Please rate the manuscript on overall contribution to the field

Good

Please rate the manuscript on language, grammar and tone

Good

Is the manuscript concise and free of repetition and redundancies?

Yes

Is the supplementary material relevant and separated appropriately from the main document?

Yes

Please rate the manuscript on overall quality

Good

If accepted, would you recommend that the article receives priority publication?

No

Are you willing to review a revision of this manuscript?

Yes

Comments to the Author:

The authors have addressed all the issues raised by the reviewer.

Reviewer B: Rounds 1 and 2

Not openly accessible under our [Publishing peer review reports](#) policy.
