

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_119556
Title of the Manuscript:	CHEMICAL QUALITY OF MORINGA PANEER PREPARED FROM BUFFALO MILK
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.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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript is not important for scientific. It lacks coherence, was poorly structured and portrays no clear understanding of what was actually studied. 2. The title is not suitable, and considering the content of the manuscript, it is difficult to formulate a title that properly depict what was done. 3. The abstract is not comprehensive. It also lacks coherence. 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are not appropriate. 5. I do not think so. 6. Most of the references in the reference list were not cited in the manuscript. Also, most of the references are not recent. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language/English quality of the article is not suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The article does not present a clear focus of the study. It is not well structured. There is need for a lot of grammatical corrections. The tables and their titles are not properly presented. Tables are supposed to be self explanatory.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tobechukwu Chijioke Iwuji
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Technology, Nigeria