

**Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Microbiology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_77445
Title of the Manuscript:	Enviromental risk factors associated with primary liver cancer in Western Kenya(A mini-Review).
Type of the Article	Minireview 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://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>The theme: <b>Enviromental risk factors associated with primary liver cancer in Western Kenya (A mini-Review)</b> is indeed important and especially for contexts in the geosciences and water resources field, this theme should indeed receive greater attention and to that end I would like to thank you for bringing together this writeup on this issue. However, the paper is challenged on many fronts with regard to the implementation of this larger objective:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The article title is appropriate.</li><li>• The abstract accurately reflects the content. However, it will be appreciative if abstract should lay out five key points:</li></ul> <p><b>Rationale</b> (1-2 sentences) - why was the research needed?</p> <p><b>Objective</b> (1 sentence)- what were you trying to provide to meet that need?</p> <p><b>Method(s)</b> (up to 3 sentences) - briefly summarize what and which parameters were measured.</p> <p><b>Results</b> (up to 4-5 sentences)- what did you find? Please add some data to demonstrate the findings.</p> <p><b>Conclusions/Recommendations</b> (1 sentence) - so what should be done with or in response to your findings?</p> <p><b>Conclusions/Recommendations</b> (1 sentence) - so what should be done with or in response to your findings?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Keywords is ok.</li><li>• The purpose or purported significance of the article is explicitly stated.</li><li>• The research study methods is lacking. Your methodology should provide context to the research you are presenting and investigating.</li><li>• Academic English: Authors should use transitional words mindfully to highlight clear and thoughtful connections among ideas.</li><li>• Some of the more relevant and new literature needs more focus as it tends to get hidden in the large amount of</li></ul>	<p>All the necessary corrections were done as indicated</p>

Review Form 1.6

	<p>generic content. [I have taken my time to get it done for the author, it has been harmonized to sustain interest]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Novelty of the work be established.</li><li>• There is enough new content in this paper to distinguish it from other works.</li><li>• The submission provides enough new material for journal publication.</li><li>• There are few grammatical and spelling mistakes. Please double check you text and correct them all.</li><li>• Make sure that all the figures are quoted in the text and in correct order, too.</li><li>• Add specific value, problems and challenges of the findings in the conclusion which is lacking in the manuscript.</li><li>• The references are comprehensive.</li></ul>	
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	