

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Archives of Current Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_99576
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF THE POTENTIALS OF WATER HYACINTH (EICHHORNIA CRASSIPES) AS RAW MATERIAL FOR BIOFERTILIZER.
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><b>Compulsory</b> 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><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community because it proposes the use of a plant that may be an environmental problem as a biofertilizer, which would benefit agriculture.</p> <p>2. Yes.</p> <p>3. Yes.</p> <p>4. Yes, but the keywords are missing. The author needs to better develop the Results item, as Figure 1 and Tables 2, 3 and 4 are not even mentioned in the text.</p> <p>5. Yes.</p> <p>6. Yes, but references need to be standardized.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, but some passages need revision, for example:            "The <b>locals</b> use the stalk and leaves of water..."            "NA, PDA, Yeast Mannitol Agar (YEMA), Okon Red Agar (ORA), Ashby Mannitol Agar (AMA) and Pikovskaya (PKV) medium each supplemented with antimicrobial agents (50µg/mL of nystatin and 75µg/mL of cycloheximide) for the enumeration of bacteria and 50mg/l of streptomycin for fungi after sterilization."            "Pure cultures of bacteri and fFungal identification were done ungal were obtained by repeated streaking on NA and PDA respectively."            "The PCR reaction included the following steps; initial denaturation of 2 min at 94°C (Pre heating) followed by 25 cycles were run on a thermal cyler..."            "Result revealed a population of <math>5.0 \times 10^5</math> cfu/g and <math>3.6 \times 10^2</math> of both bacteria and fungi than the <math>3.5 \times 10^5</math>cfu/g and <math>3.0 \times 10^2</math>sfu/g respectively for leaf (PL)."            Correct the word "cadium".</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>In Methodology: the author could better explain how the protein, lipid and fiber contents were obtained, instead of just citing the AOAC as a reference.            Pay attention to the punctuation of the text.</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ana Carla Coleone de Carvalho
Department, University & Country	São Paulo State University, UNESP, FCAV, Brazil