



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BMRJ_22728
Title of the Manuscript:	Tolerance to Heavy Metals by some Fungal Isolates from Petroleum Refinery Effluent in Kaduna, Nigeria.
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>)



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 write his/her feedback here)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The test concentrations of the metals is very low to be considered for bioremediation application, should have tried higher concentrations. Isolates were identified up to species level merely based on morphological features. The author could have studied the isolates for bioremediation ability of the isolates like metal uptake or biosorption etc., by techniques like AAS or ICP-OES or SEM-EDS rather simply assuming that the isolates as capable of removing heavy metals.	Pilot study carried out before the commencement of the experiment revealed that bioremediation could be applied as low as that test concentrations of HMs. However, several authors have used 50, 100 and 150mg/l concentration but (Ezeonuegbu <i>et al.</i> , 2014) worked on Resistance to some heavy metals among fungal flora of raw refinery effluent, using concentration as low as 5µg/l and it worked. The ability (efficiency) of the isolates for metal uptake using AAS, AA 500 model, pg instruments. London, England was done in my other manuscript sent to the Journal of Science Research and it has been accepted
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Discussion needs to focus on the results from the present study in respect with previously presented reports, not to simply re-present them.	Agreed.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		