

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_85941
Title of the Manuscript:	Ecotoxicological Evaluation Of Artisanal Effluents On Bacillus, Enterobacter, Amorphotoeca, Cladosporium and Penicillium Species In Brackish Water
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.journalmrji.com/index.php/MRJI/editorial-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	<p>The Manuscript is very interesting, however it needs a lot of serious corrections.</p> <p>1- It is necessary to format the entire manuscript, lacking the basics: Consulting the magazine's standards is essential.</p> <p>1.2- The words are together, serious error.</p> <p>1.3- Errors in measurement units, lack of correct separation.</p> <p>1.4-Format all figures and tables (correct the words, serious error).</p> <p>1.5-Insert legends on figures, better description of figures and tables.</p> <p>1.6-Format manuscript font size.</p> <p>2. Some corrections were inserted in the text, but I believe that authors should be more attentive and rewrite the manuscript more carefully, there are serious errors.</p> <p>3. Maybe if the authors had inserted a number of lines and pages, it would be easier to suggest changes in an easier way.</p> <p>4. Improve the title.</p> <p>5. Rewrite the Introduction.</p> <p>6. Check the Materials and Methods</p> <p>7. Rewrite Results.</p> <p>8. Better explain the statistics used in data processing.</p> <p>9. Rewrite the Discussion, deepen the discussion and seek new references.</p> <p>10. Rewrite the Conclusion, it needs to have more scientific basis.</p> <p>11. What is the importance of this manuscript? What he brings new to the scientific community. It would be interesting for the authors to insert more new information than the work brings, to enhance.</p> <p>12. Redo the references, are wrong, follow a pattern. I suggest looking for the standards of the Magazine. I suggest rewriting the manuscript more carefully, following the international and specific standards of the journal.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	France Anne Dias Ruas
Department, University & Country	Universidade Federal de Ouro Preto, Brazil