SCIENCEDOMAIN international

www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology.
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_46533
Title of the Manuscript:	Phylogenetic Framework and Metabolic Genes Expression Analysis of Bacteria Isolated from Contaminated Marine Environments of Niger Delta
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that <u>NO</u> manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '<u>lack of Novelty'</u>, 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)

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)

SCIENCEDOMAIN international www.sciencedomain.org



SDI 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 writ his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
	The manuscript has well-written but the introduction is too long and the methodology, is	
	repeated so the repetition should be removed.	
	The methodology is repeated in the methodology section too as the "Detection of Catabolic	
	and Surfactant Genes by PCR Analyses" section.	
	The methodology should be minimize with references only.	
	Write the figure number to plate 1 and plate 2 PCR gel pic.	
inor REVISION comments		
	The manuscript section few grammatically mistakes are present which are in Line 80	
	dehalogenases is twice in one place,	
	In line 88= [6,11,12,13,14,15]. Should be written as [6, 11-15]	
	Line 109= km should be written as Km.	
	Line 34 = et cetra should be written as etcetra.	
	Line 126 = what is (plate 16)? Remove it if it is not relavent.	
	Line 146 = why we mixed the samples write only one sentence.	
	Line 152 = write the name of the laboratory where there the experimental work was done.	
	In line 153= [17,18, 19]. as [17-19] etc,	
	Line 162 = spreaded should be spread	
	Line 167 = replace Also by also	
	Line 169= [19, 20, 21, 22]. Replace by [19-22].	
	Line 174 and 181 = replace were by was	
	Line 209 to 227 = minimize this paragraph	
	Line 231= replace tubes by tube	
	Line 238= replace was by were	
	Line 241= write the percentage of TAE.	
	Line 252= rDNA by rRNA,	
	Line 252 = 1DNA by 1NNA, Line 255 = (Ubani <i>et al.</i> , 2016). Write in numbering format according to the journal	
	quideline.	
	Line 269 to 285 merge this para in the above 209 to 227 accordingly if possible to minimize the repetition.	
	Line 288 = ensure the 60 minutes by the gel size that how much the gel size in cm.	
	Line 289 = write the band size of the product as well as the gel picture	
	graph number.	
	Line 295= replace this line "The results were considered statistically significant if the	
	probability is less than 0.05 "with good sentence.	
	Line 299= replace Total Viable Count by good relevant heading	
	Line = 312 replace Isolation and Selection Test by good and relevant heading because it is	
	look like the heading of methodology.	
	320 and 349 = replace plate by figure	
	Line 395 = replace occurrence by occurrence	
	Line 423= [11, 12, 14, 15, 19, 21, 25, 27, 30, 36, 37, 38, 39].write as	
	[11, 12, 14, 15, 19, 21, 25, 27, 30, 36-39].	
	Line 430 = remove this)	
ntianal/Cananal carrents	Line 563= replace PCR gel pic if it possible for the quality of the manuscript.	
Optional/General comments	Assessment of the seference according to the discount of suitable s	
	Arrange all of the references according to the journal guideline.	

Approved by: CEO Created by: EA Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018) Checked by: ME

SCIENCEDOMAIN international www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

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)	
If plagiarism is suspected, <u>please provide related proofs or web links.</u>	The paper has 34% similarity index so the author should to remove the plagiarism as much as possible.(up to 19%)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Noor ul Akbar
Department, University & Country	Kohat University of Science and Technology, Pakistan

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)