

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_97164
Title of the Manuscript:	Spatial Distribution and Diversity of Phytoplankton and Zooplankton and Status of physico-chemical parameters in White Nile, Blue Nile and River Nile
Type of the 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://journaljabb.com/index.php/JABB/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. <b>Although the information in the paper is not the newest, it is useful to the scientific community as it provides valuable information on the distribution of phytoplankton and zooplankton in the Nile River system, which is important for the management and conservation of this ecosystem.</b></p> <p>2. <b>The title of the article is suitable.</b></p> <p>3. <b>The abstract is comprehensive, but the language could be improved for better clarity.</b></p> <p>4. <b>The chapters and structure of the manuscript are relevant and easy to follow.</b></p> <p>5. <b>The manuscript is scientifically correct.</b></p> <p>6. <b>The list of references contains references to literature older than 5 years. The reference to the literary source from 1949 is not very relevant, and they need to be replaced. The presence of links to publications over the past 5 years indicates the relevance of this work.</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>Comments:</b></p> <p>1. <b>It is necessary to define the purpose and tasks of the research more clearly.</b></p> <p>2. <b>There are some grammatical errors that need to be corrected.</b></p> <p>3. <b>The authors could have provided more detailed information on the ecological implications of the results. For example, how might changes in physico-chemical parameters such as water temperature or pH affect the distribution and abundance of phytoplankton and zooplankton in the Nile River?</b></p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

[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>Volodymyr Voloshynovych</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Ivano-Frankivsk National Medical University, Ukraine</b>