

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_97632
Title of the Manuscript:	Heavy Metal Removal from Electronic Waste Polluted Water Using Indigenous Fungi and Its Implications on Public Health
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljamb.com/index.php/JAMB/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. Indeed, the problem of heavy metals is a huge problem that affects humanity because of the damage it causes, and it is necessary to find environmentally friendly solutions to solve it. 2. I suggested the title to be (Mycoremediation of Heavy Metal from Electronic Waste Polluted Water Using Indigenous Fungi and Its Implications). 3. Yes, the abstract expresses the research well, but it is better not to write the method inside the abstract. 4. Manuscript is somewhat appropriate. 5. yes	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript needs editing, there were a lot of mistakes.	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statics Incomprehensible, if the author uses SPSS in statics where p value and means. • It must make transmission electron microscope TEM between HM and fungi. 	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Samar Saied Sayed Ahmed Negm
Department, University & Country	Agriculture Research Center, Central Laboratory for Aquaculture, Egypt