

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_100464
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF MICROPLASTIC POLLUTION IN SELECTED WATER BODIES IN RIVERS STATE, NIGERIA
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.journalacri.com/index.php/ACRI/editorial-policy>

Review Form 1.7

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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes it's, this research is important for river and fish health efforts as well as integrated and sustainable river management</p> <p>Yes it's, The title of the article is suitable</p> <p>No , the Abstract of the article is not comprehensive</p> <p>Yes, the subsections and the structure of the text are correct.</p> <p>Yes, I think the text is scientifically correct.</p> <p>I think that are enough</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, the quality of the language / English of the article is appropriate</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Abstract : "This is a worrisome development as the water are used for domestic purpose among persons resident along the water courses and the fish species sampled is commonly available as source of protein for majority of persons." The sentence in the abstract is not quite right, it is better to show the level of microplastic pollution in the two rivers.</p> <p>MATERIALS AND METHODS : There is no information or pictures on where the New Calabar River and Bonny River are or where stations 1 and 2 are located.</p> <p>In Table 1 and Table 2 there is no explanation: R.T. (min) and Peak Area</p> <p>There is no explanation, was fish (<i>Pseudotolithus elongatus</i>) used as a sample for the two rivers? Even though the salinity of the two rivers is different (freshwater and seawater/estuary).</p> <p>DISCUSSION : there is no discussion that compares the quantitative value of microplastics in water, fish and sediment (Table 1 and Table 2) with the criteria for microplastic pollution levels.</p>	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Aditya Irawan
Department, University & Country	Mulawarman University, Indonesia