

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. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	1-Yes It is an exciting study to explain the effect of make-up and cosmetic tools on the transmission of disease. 2- No (Study the effect of make-up tools on the transmission of Bacteriological in the human body) 3- Partially comprehensive. It needs a scientific reformulation commensurate with common scientific research. Some important results and the names of some of the Test names (Checkups) used must be mentioned. 4- ABSTRACT 1. INTRODUCTION 2. EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM 2.1. Apparatus and Procedures 2.2. Experimental Procedure 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION 3.1. Results 4. CONCLUSIONS REFERENCES 5-The study is scientifically valid but poor for discussion It is also poor for scientific examinations 6- References are insufficient and require recent scientific research (2022-2023)	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	No . You need to formulate the article in scientific language/English	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Naser Korde Zedin
Department, University & Country	University of Technology, Iraq