

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">South Asian Journal of Research in Microbiology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJRM_98222
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF BIOREMEDIATION POTENTIAL OF ALGAE ( <i>Chlorella vulgaris</i> ) IN CRUDE OIL CONTAMINATED SEDIMENT
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.journalsajrm.com/index.php/SAJRM/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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>Yes. Bioremediation is a current issue, and the use of microalgae to biodegrade hydrocarbon compounds is an interesting idea.</p> <p>This is a suitable title for the article</p> <p>The abstract is informative. It exceeds 300 words in length (519 words) because there is a lot of work. It describes the purpose of the work, techniques and methods used major findings with important data and conclusions. But please put fewer keywords, and correct some error mentioned in red in the text</p> <p>The structure is appropriate but the number of subsections must be revisited. So, Starting from introduction with section 1(ex: 1. Introduction, 4. Conclusion etc)</p> <p>Yes. But, the <b>introduction</b> must provide a factual background and clearly defined problem and the scope. There is not the justification or the aim of the work done. And it is too long, so summary the introduction</p> <p>The references must be more recent because 37% of your references are from the ten years ago, and only 6 references are from 2017 to now, in a total of 47 references</p> <p>Also, Please check all references, and write like the following style giving from the journal in the submission guide:</p> <p><i>For Published paper:</i></p> <p>Hilly M, Adams ML, Nelson SC. A study of digit fusion in the mouse embryo. Clin Exp Allergy. 2002;32(4):489-98.</p> <p><b>Reference to a book:</b></p> <p><i>Personal author(s)</i></p> <p>Rang HP, Dale MM, Ritter JM, Moore PK. Pharmacology. 5th ed. Edinburgh: Churchill Livingstone; 2003.</p> <p><b>Please check your references, some of them were false:</b>  <b>Reference number 8 (error)</b>, this is the correct reference:  Rosenberg E, Ron EZ. Bioremediation of Petroleum Contamination. In: Crawford RL, Crawford DL. Eds., Bioremediation: Principles and Applications. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge; 1998  <b>Reference number 24: the correct form:</b> Janse Van Vuuren S, Taylor J, Gerber A, Van Ginkel C. Easy identification of the most common freshwater algae: a guide for the identification of microscopic algae in South African freshwaters. North-West University and Department of Water Affairs and Forestry; 2006  <b>Reference number 10, 17 and 32:</b> error in the title (all the correct titles are in the manuscript)  <b>And other errors mentioned in the manuscript</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Yes	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	No comments	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Oucif Hanane</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Relizane, Algeria</b>