

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_121132
Title of the Manuscript:	The Bioremediation Process Of Liquid Waste from A Fish Auction Place is Based on The Parameters of COD (Chemical Oxygen Demand) And Ammonia (NH3)
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1-reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

[Review Form 3](#)

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =		

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I hope the comments below if considered might give an advantage to the author to develop the paper. “The Bioremediation Process Of Liquid Waste from A Fish Auction Place is Based on The Parameters of COD (Chemical Oxygen Demand) And Ammonia (NH3)” After careful consideration, I have outlined few points that, if addressed, could significantly enhance the quality of the paper:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The abstract provides general information about the topic but needs to be concise and well-structured. It should highlight the introduction, problem statement, methodology, and findings of the present study, all of which are currently missing. 2. Keywords must be listed in alphabetical order. 3. Instruments and materials must be described first, followed by research methods." 4. Fig. 1, and Fig 4., needs good pixel image. 5. Check Fig 2. Y axis, X axis title missing 6. Check the grammatical mistakes throughout the manuscript. 	

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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Manoj Pandurang Wagh
Department, University & Country	Dr. Vithalrao Vikhe Patil College of Engineering, Savitribai Phule Pune University, India