



GPH Review Form

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Biosciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJORIB_1616
Title of the Manuscript:	DEGRADATIVE CAPABILITY OF MICROBIAL CULTURE, CARROT PEEL WASTE AND CARBON DOT IN REMEDIATION OF PETROLEUMHYDROCARBON IN SOIL
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://globalpresshub.com/index.php/AJORIB/editorial-policy>)



PART 1: Review Comments

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1(10-04-2018)



[GPH Review Form](#)

<p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The methodology adopted is reasonable; various information-based parameters like study area, physicochemical analysis, Gas chromatographic analysis, microbiological analysis and statistical analysis are made amply clear.</p> <p>The Results & Discussion section provides satisfactory information about the findings from the present study which is aptly presented through the tables and graphs.</p> <p>The conclusion section in the manuscript suitably provides a concise summarize of the key findings, significance, implications and a sense of closure to the study.</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically correct and relevant, it succeeds in translating the benchwork to the scientific content. The research work makes a meaningful contribution to the field and its scientific undertone is strong.</p> <p>Recent pertinent references are included in the body of the text as well as in the Bibliography. The number of references included are majorly from the past decade and are sufficiently incorporated to evaluate the quality and reliability of the data.</p> <p>Compliance: The manuscript is compliant with the aims and scope of the study. Readability: Well-written and readable but can be more grammatically rich Presentability: Properly presented</p> <p>Originality: Fair</p> <p>Depth of research: Good</p> <p>Technical quality: Reasonable</p> <p>Credibility: The manuscript does meet a reasonable standard of quality and credibility.</p>	
---	---	--

GPH Review Form

Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality throughout the manuscript is reasonable and suitable for scholarly communications; the content is clear but have some random typographical error. It is recommended that the manuscript is checked and made grammatically more correct.	
Optional/General comments	This review report presents an unbiased critique of the submitted research paper with the advice on its suitability for publication. The manuscript, apart from meeting a good standard of quality and credibility, seems relevant to the scientific community at large.	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sarika Chhabria Talreja
Department, University & Country	Smt. C.H.M College, India