

Editorial Comment:

I have gone through all the stages for evaluating the manuscript under review and my comments are as follows:

1. Two, out of three reviewers have made scientifically sound comments on the manuscript and I do agree with their comments.

None of the reviewers rejected the manuscript after the final corrections were done by the authors of the manuscript.

3. The authors have complied with the instructions of the reviewers,

I hereby recommend that the manuscript “Microbial diversity and heavy metals concentration of wood smoked fish from Edonwhii Fishing Settlement in Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria” be accepted for publication in our Journal after correction of below mentioned grammatical mistakes and sentencing errors, found during my evaluation.

1. Line No. 26: Delete ‘according to findings by’
2. Line No. 29: Delete ‘according to’ and combine both references.
3. Line No. 34: ‘various preservation techniques like smoking’. Name few more preservation techniques used along with smoking
4. Line No. 44: ‘But this study evaluates the microbial and heavy metal presence in smoked processed fishes in Edonwhii community.’ Whenever we are writing Introduction for a manuscript, we try to make things flow in a manner that emphasizes the importance of work mentioned ahead. Authors are mentioning importance of smoking process and then suddenly adding the last line of the Introduction paragraph, with no connection with the previous statements. Rewrite the last few sentences showing importance of the work done.
5. Line No. 57-58: ‘Also collected, were samples of red mangrove woods used as wood-fuel for the fish smoking process.’ Rewrite the line as “The samples of red mangrove woods (used as fuel in smoking process) were also collected.”
6. Line No. 137: ‘The bacterial encountered’. What bacterial? Bacterial colonies or bacteria or something else?
7. Line 178: ‘The research study’ modify it to “The present study”

Author feedback:

All items on this review have been duly noted and effected.