

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Annual Research &amp; Review in Biology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_95279
Title of the Manuscript:	BIOREMEDIATION TOFU LIQUID WASTE BASED ON CHEMICAL OXYGEN DEMAND (COD) PARAMETERS
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.journalarrb.com/index.php/ARRB/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><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>It is well known that tofu is a organic product, and it will have good load of microbes which will have the ability to degrade the waste produced, Organism identified mentioned as <i>Bacillus subtilus</i> could also be from the environment.</p> <p>No, it needs to be reframed grammatically incorrect.</p> <p>No, kindly refer for the Author guidelines laid down by the Journal</p> <p>Materials and method do not seem to be proper.</p> <p>Not very significant.</p> <p>References not as per journal guidelines, most of the references does not show page number nor the links for the journal.</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 need to be formatted, superscripts have not be used in mainly places, leading to a lot of misinterpretation.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>A good amount of work is done the quality also appears to be good, but certain basic analysis are missing which could confirm the possibility of microbes present other than <i>Bacillus subtilus</i>.</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Bhakti A Mhatre</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>D Y Patil Deemed to be University, India</b>