



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Archives of Current Research International |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_ACRI_46679 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Effects of Aromatic Hydrocarbons and Marine Water from Niger Delta on the β -Galactosidase Activity of Mutant Escherichia coli |
| 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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 | There are a number of issues raised on clarification of statements or omissions noted in the attached annotated manuscript. Those related to method description and units in tables are considered compulsory. Also | The number of issues raised in the manuscript were stated and clarified. Those related to the method description and units in Tables were also clarified. The issues on conductivity, COD, BOD were discovered to be due to misplacement of values as confirmed from the original results supplied by the laboratory analyst. The issue of un-normalised sediment inorganic constituents like Al were not analysed in this study as they were considered and cited in several articles used in this study as guide like https://www.researchgate.net/publication/7610289 |
| Minor REVISION comments | The issues raised in the annotated manuscript that relate to elaboration on interpretation are considered Minor and it would improve the value of the manuscript if attended to. E.g. the issue of reporting un-normalised sediment inorganic constituents | The issue regarding elaboration on interpretation of results were considered and effected and new references added. |
| Optional/General comments | An interesting and potentially useful paper | The whole corrections effected were highlighted in yellow colour. |

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? | (If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details) | There are no ethical issues in this manuscript. |