

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Annual Research &amp; Review in Biology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_105595
Title of the Manuscript:	Microbial Quality Evaluation of Seafood Samples from the Vishakhapatnam Coast, Andhra Pradesh
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.journalarrb.com/index.php/ARRB/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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>The manuscript has an essentiality to the scientific community as it addresses matters food security.</b></li> <li>2. <b>The title well suites the manuscript</b></li> <li>3. <b>The manuscript is not comprehensive enough to cover all the aspects of the research done. It mainly dwells on the introductory section. It should cover the whole work in a summary. It is also too short.</b></li> <li>4. <b>The subsections are much appropriate.</b></li> <li>5. <b>It is scientifically sound.</b></li> <li>6. <b>The references are few but a bit recent. The author should ensure that they are between 15-25.</b></li> </ol> <p>In addition;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>On line 11, the sentence is not grammatically sensible.</b></li> <li>2. <b>All the in-text citations should be indicated using square brackets i.e. [2]</b></li> <li>3. <b>When was the research done? The timeline needs to be indicated.</b></li> <li>4. <b>Paragraphing – there are several unnecessary spaces after paragraphs which need to be done away with e.g. line 4, 61, 62, 84, 113. An indented format of paragraphing should be used in the entire document.</b></li> <li>5. <b>References – falling indent format of paragraphing should be used.</b></li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>The language used is fair enough.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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:	<b>Bryan Okoth Omondi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Eldoret, Kenya</b>