

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	Research

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> <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 manuscript provides valuable information on the microbial growth of <i>Chlorella vulgaris</i> using oil palm extract as a substrate. Blending ratio of substrates used for media formulation was established and the optimum conditions for growth is adequately provided</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>The abstract can be improved by stating relevant methodologies and hypotheses that led to the results</p> <p>Yes, the manuscript is well-arranged and structured</p> <p>The methodologies and procedures used in the manuscript were scientifically correct. Though, better statistical or modeling software would have provided clearer information on the optimization condition of <i>Chlorella vulgaris</i> No, the references are not recent and most importantly not up to date.</p> <p>To address the inadequacies in the manuscript and to improve the manuscript for publication. I have prepared my comments in a separate file which will be attached to this document.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>English language of the manuscript needs to be improved. The assistance of a native English speaker can be sought to improve the manuscript's structure, punctuation, and concord.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There are a lot of incomplete or hanging sentences; authors will have to review the manuscript thoroughly for clarity. 2. The English quality of the manuscript should be improved to avoid unclear statements and ambiguity. The author should pay attention to the usage of articles, punctuation, and agreement between subjects and verbs. 3. The authors should include the applications or usefulness of <i>Chlorella vulgaris</i> in the introductory part. 4. The research gap was not properly identified, authors should clearly include and highlight the research gap in their revised manuscript. 5. The authors should justify and properly situate the focus of this study. The authors should provide sufficient ground or premises that inspired this work in the concluding part of the introduction. <p>Methodology and Results</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. The source of the biomass (<i>Chlorella vulgaris</i>) used in this study was not stated. Authors should provide and include information regarding the source, handling and pretreatment of their biomass 7. Under 2.10, authors should provide the composition of novel synthetic media used in this study with citation(s) 8. This line should be revisited to correct the wrong interpretation "The results depict 180:20 which is also equivalent to the 80:20 for the Empty Fruit Bunch (EFB) and Oil Palm Cake (OPC)" 9. The two positive controls in Figure 3 should be properly labeled or tagged in the picture. 10. Under 3.7, the authors should revisit this statement "an exponential phase followed." 	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>11. Results can be further improved by comparing findings in this study with other previous studies on <i>Chlorella vulgaris</i> growth. Authors should compare the effects of variables used with the results presented in the literature</p> <p>12. The discussion can be better improved by updating the section with recent articles. Authors should consider reading and including these works in their manuscript</p> <p>https://doi.org/10.22034/gjesm.2017.03.02.010 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2015.09.067 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2014.05.031 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enconman.2018.03.020</p> <p>Authors should add relevant current journals to further enrich the discussion. The conclusion ought to include the major findings and takeaways of the study. The authors should improve the conclusion by including relevant data to justify the contribution to knowledge.</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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Olayomi Abiodun Falowo
Department, University & Country	Landmark University, Nigeria