

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_100110
Title of the Manuscript:	Optimum conditions for Cultivation of Chlorella vulgaris on Oil Palm Residue Extracts
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://journaljabb.com/index.php/JABB/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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Yes Yes No No Average Average <p>Optimum conditions for Cultivation of <i>Chlorella vulgaris</i> on Oil Palm Residue Extracts</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Abstract need revamping. The whole abstract needs to be rewritten. Unacceptable currently. Normally the abstract should have an introduction, problem statement, objective of the work, methodology, results and conclusion. Needs to recheck the grammatical errors and restructure the articles for the whole manuscript. The introduction section need improvement with better flow of story line startingwith literature review on oil palm residues extract, then start to focus on the problem statement of the study of this article on the cultivations using <i>C. vulgaris</i> and relates to the optimum conditions. Please make your introduction end with objective of this study so enhance the introduction section presentation. Methodology needs revamping, normally a good article publication, all methodology procedures and steps can be repeated by the readers. Therefore, all chemicals, equipment, tools used must be as clear as possible. For instance, chemicals need to be stated which brand and the country of origin including the equipment's used for the methodology. So far, the methodology section is currentlyat an unacceptable condition. Methodology section, better to illustrate the steps so that the readers can visualizethe sequential steps for the whole procedures. Prepare as in Figure. Methodology has analysis steps, please elaborate clearly the steps using the equipment so that the results presented in table 1 is clearly understood was obtainedusing which steps and analytical steps. Table 1 parameters need clearer units for all the numbers. It is not yet understood how to read the numbers without the units presented in the table. Section 3.1 needsto be elaborated in words to explain the results. 	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>8. Same goes to Table 2, the same comments as in comment 7.</p> <p>9. Simple key, which results being presented in any article, for each section of results, please make sure that the procedures and steps used to generate the results are clearly presented in the methodology section.</p> <p>10. Fig 1 needs elaboration in words in the results, normally 3 points is inadequate, normally as minimum as 5 points for a good representation of results.</p> <p>11. Figure 2, the objective of these results is still vague. Please make it clear why uneed these results?</p> <p>12. Figure 3l the same comments as commented in comment 11.</p> <p>13. Figure 4, the same comments as commented in comments 11 and 12. Please write the captions for all figures appropriately with the full definitions for all terms used, abbreviations used to include units for all parameters presented.</p> <p>14. Figure 5, same comments as commented in comment 11, 12 and 13. Again to remind you that all figures presented should come from a clear objective of the work, please make sure all the objectives and procedures needed as clearly presented before the results and discussion section.</p> <p>15. Figure 6, the same comments as commented in comments 11, 12,13 and 14. For any observations using optical density, normally discussion on maximum optical density needs to be explained, why until those values and not waiting until death phase?</p> <p>16. Figure 7, the same comments as commented in all other figures. Please make amendments.</p> <p>17. Figure 8, same comments as commented in all other figures. Please make amendments.</p> <p>18. Please make amends, the section results and discussion should be combined. All the discussion can be discussed right after the results have been presented in the same section of the article.</p> <p>19. As for the conclusion section, please add the future predictions or the outlook of this article's work with the current results and discussion.</p> <p>20. Normally in the discussion section, only add literature that compares the results from this article results obtained from experiments to previously same experiments on the same work for comparative discussion. Other than that, please add that in the introduction section. Please make sure all methodology is explained earlier in the methodology section but not to firstly mentioned in the results and discussion section.</p> <p>21. Define optimal in the methodology section that focusses on the fundamentals of the objective of the optimization topic of the objectives of this article.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>No, needs revisions</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Amizon Azizan
Department, University & Country	School of Chemical Engineering, College of Engineering, Universiti Teknologi MARA, Malaysia