

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOB_98303
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECTS OF LIGHT ON THE GROWTH AND β -carotene ACCUMULATION IN THE GREEN ALGAE <i>Dunaliella salina</i>
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.journalajob.com/index.php/AJOB/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes, it is. 2. Yes, it is. 3. It can be improve 4. It can be improve 5. It can be improve 6. It can be improve <p>First of all, congratulations to the authors for the work done, since it is clear, concise and easily understandable. Likewise, the language used is clear as well as the structure followed in it. However, it can be substantially modified by following the proposals below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Within the introductory section, mention can be made of the methodology used in more detail so that the rector can get an idea of the methodology followed in the same. - hey the introduction section can be modified since it can justify in greater detail the research gap covered by the research as well as detailing the objective of the research point in the same way, mention can be made of the parts that the research will contain. - Any article that intends to be published in a high impact journal should have a literature review section that covers the state of the art so far, which in this case does not exist, so it would be necessary to make a literature review section that clearly details the state of the art so far as well as the research gap covered with this study. - The methodology section is clear and concise although it could be detailed a little more so that the reader understands it clearly. - The results are described in a very reduced manner and can also be expanded in more detail depending on the images contained therein. - Once the literature review section is developed as it should be necessary to complete the discussion section with all those studies that allow us to get an idea of the state of the question so far as well as the research gap covered. - It would be necessary to add a conclusion section specifying the objective of the research with the research gap covered as well as the main results achieved, the contribution of the study as well as the main limitations and proposed lines of research. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	Yes, it is.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	Once all these aspects have been modified, it would be necessary to reanalyze the manuscript before making a decision on its publication.	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Madel Consuelo Ruiz Rodríguez
Department, University & Country	University of Jaén, Spain