Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**Journal of Applied Life Sciences International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JALSI_101746**
Title of the Manuscript:	**COMPARATIVE STUDY OF METAGENOMIC PROFILE OF BACTERIA STRAINS PRESENT IN AN ABANDONED ARTISANAL REFINERY SITE, IN OBI-AYAGHA COMMUNITY,DELTA STATE**
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.journaljalsi.com/index.php/JALSI/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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments **1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?** (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) **2. Is the title of the article suitable?** (If not please suggest an alternative title) **3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?** **4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** **5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?** **6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	The manuscript is important for the scientific community as it addresses the significance of studying soil microbiota in the context of hydrocarbon pollution and bioremediation. The findings shed light on the bacterial community structure in contaminated soil and provide insights into potential bioremediation strategies. Understanding the genetic diversity and functional potential of microorganisms involved in bioremediation processes is crucial for developing effective remediation techniques. The title of the article, "Metagenomic profiling reveals bacterial community structure in hydrocarbon-impacted soil," is suitable as it accurately reflects the main focus of the study. It conveys the use of metagenomic profiling to investigate the bacterial community structure in soil affected by hydrocarbon contamination. The abstract of the article appears to be comprehensive. It provides a clear overview of the study's objectives, methodology, and key findings. It summarizes the importance of soil microbiota, the relevance of hydrocarbon pollution, and the significance of metagenomic profiling for understanding microbial communities in contaminated soil. Without the actual subsections and structure of the manuscript provided, it is difficult to assess their appropriateness. However, based on the information given, the manuscript seems to follow a logical structure by introducing the research background, explaining the methods used, presenting the results, and discussing their implications. The scientific correctness of the manuscript cannot be determined without a detailed review of the research methods, data analysis, and results. However, the use of high-throughput sequencing and metagenomic profiling for studying soil microbiota is a well-established approach in the field. The study's findings align with previous research on the impact of hydrocarbon pollution on bacterial communities and the potential for bioremediation. The references are not provided in the given information, so their sufficiency and recency cannot be assessed. It is essential for the manuscript to include relevant and recent references to support the study's findings and place them within the existing scientific literature. If additional references are needed, it would depend on the specific aspects discussed in the manuscript, but a comprehensive review of recent studies on soil microbiota, hydrocarbon pollution, and bioremediation would be beneficial. Providing information on the sample size, sampling locations, and other relevant environmental parameters would enhance the reproducibility and generalizability of the study.	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	Based on the provided article, the language and English quality of the article are suitable for scholarly communications. The article follows a standard scientific writing style and effectively communicates the aim, methodology, results, and conclusion of the study. There are some grammaticle errors that need to be fixed. Therefore, based on the language and content of the article, it appears to be suitable for scholarly communications.	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.7

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:	**Chiti Agarwal**
Department, University & Country	**University of Maryland, USA**