

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_116509
Title of the Manuscript:	RHIZOSPHERE ASSOCIATED BACTERIA IN BIOREMEDIATION OF CRUDE OIL POLLUTED AQUATIC ENVIRONMENT
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://www.journalajarr.com/index.php/AJARR/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> <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><b>Yes, it's important for the scientific community, as well as it's beneficial to health issue.</b></p> <p><b>Yes, the title of the article is appropriately suitable.</b></p> <p><b>Yes, the abstract of the article is completely comprehensive.</b></p> <p><b>Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriately, quite changes suggested in minor comments.</b> <b>Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct.</b></p> <p><b>Yes, references are sufficient and try to add some recent ones. Some reference is not as per the journal, work on the same.</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>Yes, language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly Communications.</p>	
<p>• <b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shorten and rewrite the abstract section</li> <li>• Add more relevant results from literature survey to support and strengthen the Manuscript.</li> <li>• Modify the conclusion section; it is not so much clear to the reviewer.</li> </ul>	

### 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>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ashish Wamanrao Selokar
Department, University & Country	Mohsinbhai Zaveri Mahavidyalaya Desaiganj (Wadsa), India