

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_77445
Title of the Manuscript:	Enviromental risk factors associated with primary liver cancer in Western Kenya(A mini-Review).
Type of the Article	Minireview 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:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>The theme: Enviromental risk factors associated with primary liver cancer in Western Kenya (A mini-Review) is indeed important and especially for contexts in the geosciences and water resources field, this theme should indeed receive greater attention and to that end I would like to thank you for bringing together this writeup on this issue. However, the paper is challenged on many fronts with regard to the implementation of this larger objective:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The article title is appropriate. • The abstract accurately reflects the content. However, it will be appreciative if abstract should lay out five key points: <p>Rationale (1-2 sentences) - why was the research needed? Objective (1 sentence)- what were you trying to provide to meet that need? Method(s) (up to 3 sentences) - briefly summarize what and which parameters were measured. Results (up to 4-5 sentences)- what did you find? Please add some data to demonstrate the findings. Conclusions/Recommendations (1 sentence) - so what should be done with or in response to your findings? Conclusions/Recommendations (1 sentence) - so what should be done with or in response to your findings?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keywords is ok. • The purpose or purported significance of the article is explicitly stated. • The research study methods is lacking. Your methodology should provide context to the research you are presenting and investigating. • Academic English: Authors should use transitional words mindfully to highlight clear and thoughtful connections among ideas. • Some of the more relevant and new literature needs more focus as it tends to get hidden in the large amount of generic 	

Review Form 1.6

	<p>content. [I have taken my time to get it done for the author, it has been harmonized to sustain interest]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Novelty of the work be established. • There is enough new content in this paper to distinguish it from other works. • The submission provides enough new material for journal publication. • There are few grammatical and spelling mistakes. Please double check you text and correct them all. • Make sure that all the figures are quoted in the text and in correct order, too. • Add specific value, problems and challenges of the findings in the conclusion which is lacking in the manuscript. • The references are comprehensive. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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>
<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:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Raimi Morufu Olalekan</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Niger Delta University, Nigeria</p>