

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_95853
Title of the Manuscript:	PHYSICOCHEMICAL AND MICROBIOLOGICAL EVALUATION OF SOIL AND EFFLUENT CONTAMINATED WITH AZO-DYE IN ITOKU, ABEOKUTA OGUN 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.journalmrji.com/index.php/MRJI/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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> 4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> 5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> 6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	<p>The document is of scientific importance, however the objectives of the work are not clear and practical conclusions are not reached.</p> <p><b>No. A new title should be proposed based on the objectives and conclusions obtained</b></p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>There is no minimum handling of statistics, although it is mentioned in the methodology. No comparisons are made between treatments, which does not allow us to conclude whether or not there is contamination, or if there is a natural process of biodegradation. Discussions should be worked on to compare results from other studies.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The design of the tables is poor. There are typographical errors (marked in yellow) as indicated in the attached document.	

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Alfonso Benítez de la Torre</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Mexico</b>