

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_96791
Title of the Manuscript:	Biological Uptake of Chromium and Copper from Aqueous Systems by Penicillium notatum Biomass
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://journaljabb.com/index.php/JABB/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)
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)	1. Yes, the manuscript is valuable. Tracking the chemical fate and transport of heavy metals is a vital means of environmental analysis, especially considering the current prevalence of the advanced electronic industry and processes that lead to this pollution. 2. Yes, the title is suitable 3. The abstract should say more in the first few sentences about reasons to conduct such a study from a more broad perspective. 4. These are appropriate and easy to follow 5. Yes, the manuscript appears to be correct. More specifically, there are indications of good methodology and 6. The references support this body of work; however, I would recommend finding one or two references in the last five years to supplement the study.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the English is suitable; however, I have indicated some editing suggestions.	
Optional/General comments	Overall nice work on the methodology, but paper could indicate broader reasons for the importance of conducting this study. Excellent description of results!	

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:	Jaime Thissen
Department, University & Country	International Society of Sustainability, United States