

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Microbiology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMB_104760</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Physicochemical and Microbiological Assessment of Utaewa Estuary Water</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### 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.journaljamb.com/index.php/JAMB/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)
<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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community. The article focuses on the quality of drinking water resources. This subject remains topical, particularly in developing countries.</p> <p>2. yes, the title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>3. No, the abstract of the article is not comprehensive. The summary of the results of the physico-chemical analyzes is missing.</p> <p>4. Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>5. Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. The references are sufficient and recent. However, the references used for the methodology of analysis of the physico-chemical parameters are too old, they must be reviewed (APHA [12] and WHO [13]).</p> <p><b>On page 6, in table 1, the author gives the water standards (WHO and NIS) without giving us the references of this source.</b></p> <p><b>On page 10 in the discussion, the author like the discussion with an introduction, which is not necessary.</b></p> <p><b>In the conclusion part, the author omitted to mention the results obtained from the physico-chemical parameters.</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>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ballet Tiama Guy Nicaise</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Nangui Abrogoua University , Côte d'Ivoire</b>