



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Annual Research & Review in Biology |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_ARRB_47494 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Potential of different fungi species in biodegradation field of phenolic compounds |
| Type of the Article | Review Paper original 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 | 1. Is it review paper or original article 2. Have you isolated fungi from sea water? Justify in introduction. 3. Give method of isolation of fungi and identification method. 4. 0.4% , 0.6% and 0.8% this particular concentrations selected? Justify. 5. Check the reference citation method. 6. How chlorella growth and bioremediation is correlated in the study? Justify in introduction. | 1- It is original article 2- isolated fungi from sea water as water polluted with phenol and this mentioned in the introduction. 3- I write the method for isolation and add the microscope for identification of fungi by reference no. 23 4- most of paper used the concentration low this concentration with other species of fungi for this I increased the concentration of phenol. 5- done 6 –We are the first research to use algae to detect the intermediate compounds resulting from phenol decomposition, so there is no research supporting this point |
| 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? no | (If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details) | |