

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>)

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>Yes, the information provided about the phylogenetic novelty observed during this study makes an important contribution towards a better understanding of the microbial diversity..</p> <p>Yes, it is self-explanatory.</p> <p>Yes. It is short and covers the Zeist of the manuscript.</p> <p>Yes, the manuscript is having sections and subsections at appropriate places.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes, references are recent, but there should be one pattern while writing the references. Also, many references are very old, it should not be more than 10 year old.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. There some punctuation and grammatical errors throughout the manuscript.</p> <p>2. In the bibliography portion the text does not have uniformity and the paragraphs are not in justifying mode.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nancy Sheoran
Department, University & Country	Lala Lajpat Rai University of Veterinary and Animal Sciences, India