

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_100319
Title of the Manuscript:	Extracellular synthesis of Fe-NPs by bacteria/biosurfactant, kinetic parameter and reduction of Cr (VI) from pollutant samples
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.journaljamb.com/index.php/JAMB/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>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>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? YES, the manuscript is of paramount importance to the academic community.</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? YES, it is within your goals</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Yes, the summary covers the topic addressed in its entirety.</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Yes, they are appropriate to the reality of the problem addressed.</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Yes, because it covers the proposed methodology.</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. More recent references must be added</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Regarding the quality of the language, it is observed that it is well written and meets the needs of the work.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Follow author guidelines</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Givanildo de Gois
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Acre, Campus Cruzeiro do Sul, Brazil