

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Biotechnology Journal International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_BJI_95344</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>THE EFFECT OF ALTERNARIA SP., ASPERGILLUS SP., FUSARIUM SP. ON THE HEAVY METAL POLLUTED RIVER OF MMIRI ELE IN NNEWI, ANAMBRA STATE.</b>
Type of the 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.journalbjournal.com/index.php/BJI/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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No, it needs more information about the obtained results Abstract is very weak, it should express general idea about the work</p> <p>Not at all</p> <p>It needs more expression of the obtained data</p> <p>No, reference section should be improved and supported with more recent referenmces</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Manuscript needs a thorough edit for correct English and grammar</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p><b>Abstract:</b> is very weak, it should summarize the obtained data in brief</p> <p><b>Introduction:</b> is poorly structured and missing key background information and contains insufficient details. A separate section heading is not needed for "Aim of the work"</p> <p><b>Result:</b> section not well synthesized or presented in the context of the broader literature.</p> <p><b>Discussion:</b> paragraphs are poorly structured, there is no clear explaining of the obtained data.</p> <p><b>Conclusion:</b> is very poor structure and contains insufficient details</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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mona Ibrahim Abd El Naby Kaamoush
Department, University & Country	Arab Academy for Science, Technology and Maritime Transport, Egypt