

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JABB_97117 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Cyanobacteria and microalgae of the shallow mountain lake Paučko, Konjuh Mountain |
| 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>)

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>1. Monitoring natural environments as well as identifying the species present there are essential for the preservation and conservation of environmental diversity.</p> <p>2. Title suggestion: The great diversity of cyanobacteria and microalgae in the shallows mountain lake Paučko, Konjuh Mountain.</p> <p>3. Like the discussion, the abstract needs tweaking. The authors need to describe how the findings are relevant.</p> <p>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are ok.</p> <p>5. Yes, although it is simple and has yet to give new knowledge.</p> <p>6. No, the references are old; of the 41 references cited, 32 are more than ten years old.</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | <p>1. The language is ok</p> | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | <p>The article needs to be adjusted, especially in discussing the results. There is no concise, current, and critical discussion of the results. The authors need to show the relevance and impact of their findings. The meeting of the results is feeble; it needs to be better structured and discussed with the current literature.</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> | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name: | Rachel de Moraes Ferreira |
| Department, University & Country | University Federal of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil |