

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_96467
Title of the Manuscript:	A Bacteriological of Make-up Tools used in Calabar Metropolis, Cross River State, Nigeria
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.journalarjass.com/index.php/ARJASS/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)	This manuscript is very interesting, and very important for educating the public in the future. agree with the title I think the abstract is good. but there are cons between research results and conclusions. look in the comments of the script that I gave. I think it's appropriate, but in my opinion it needs additional data analysis in the method material section and needs additional discussion, because there are results that are not reviewed in the manuscript. (see my comments on the script) I think it's correct and reasonable I think the reference is sufficient. but it would definitely be better if you add to it by reading other articles that are similar to your research	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	I think the script is very well written	
Optional/General comments	This script is very interesting	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Freshinta Jellia Wibisono
Department, University & Country	Wijaya Kusuma Surabaya University, Indonesia