

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_107227
Title of the Manuscript:	Particle-picking in cryo-electron microscopy images with online resources
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes</p> <p>2. Yes</p> <p>3. Needs to be rewritten.</p> <p>4. Not appropriate, see my comments.</p> <p>5. Needs more discussion.</p> <p>6. Yes</p> <p><u>Additional suggestions/comments</u></p> <p>Authors do not state the problem they are trying to solve. There is no detailed review of related works showing the limitation of the works and why the author(s) work is different.</p> <p>Paragraph 1 is not clear on Materials and Methods section. It was stated that the dataset is public and how it was acquired was also written. Was the dataset acquired online or captured.</p> <p>Section 2 (Material and Methods) and 3 (Methodology) are the same, merge them together and rewrite to be more explanatory and detailed.</p> <p>The methods were not very detailed and difficult to comprehend. It doesn't show how the research is been done.</p> <p>Fig 3 is not supposed to be under conclusion section.</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>	The paper needs to be reworked. The methods are not properly explained, the results are not properly discussed. The conclusion does not show any conclusion. Everything was muddled up.	

[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>Matthias Omotayo Oladele</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Federal Polytechnic, Nigeria</b>