

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_104760
Title of the Manuscript:	Physicochemical and Microbiological Assessment of Utaewa Estuary Water
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.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)
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>	<p>The theme is important since it is about the quality of water for domestic use and that has great relevance in the quality of life of people</p> <p>The title reflects the objectives of the research. So I think the title of the article is appropriate.</p> <p>The abstract is not structured.</p> <p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are.</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically written properly.</p> <p>The references are limited and older than 10 years. You should make an exhaustive and recent search of the references</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<p>The English used in the article is suitable for communication between academic and scientific peers.</p>	
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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hermes Ulises Ramirez Sanchez
Department, University & Country	Instituto De Astronomia Y Meteorologia, Universidad De Guadalajara, Mexico