

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Pathogen Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPR_119070
Title of the Manuscript:	HYDROCARBON DEGRADATION AND BIODEGRADERS IN OIL SPILLAGE SITES IN PORT HARCOURT
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.journalijpr.com/index.php/IJPR/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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>No need to change.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Thanks for giving this opportunities for reviewing this article. It has some corrections and need to be change before publish.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Results not discussed in the Abstract. For Example: Bacterial growth in terms of % variation. It may show the clarity of the findings. 2. In materials and Methods, the three labelled as ss1, ss2, ss3 and control. But author not discussed throughout the manuscript. 3. What is the short form of MS medium. 4. Author should provide the make and model of the microscopy. 5. Author mentioned in the able A, B, C, D, E as a Isolate code. What is denotes is it represent any bacterial organisms. 6. Author why not discuss Colonies on an Agar Plate. If the author do that the quality of the paper becomes good. 7. Author not discussed about the each table in the discussion section. It is very general way of representation on the discussion section. Pls improve and modify. 8. Conclusion not enough. Add the result which finding is best as a potential agent of bioremediation of environmental hydrocarbon pollution. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Author should check the language correction</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	N. R. Dhineshbabu
Department, University & Country	T. John Institute of Technology, India