

Manuscript: **“Performance Of Inherent Electrogens In Benthic Sediment Mud At Different pH Conditions In Microbial Fuel Cell”**

**Submitted: 14 August 2020**

**Accepted: 30 September 2020**

**Published: 31 October 2020**

Corresponding Author: Binjal Pradhan

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2020.v16n30p1](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2020.v16n30p1)

Peer review:

**Reviewer 1:** Olotu Titilayo  
Adeleke University, Ede/ Nigeria

**Reviewer 2:** Dr. Reuben Tamakloe

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020***

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.  
***ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!***

Reviewer Name: <b>Olotu Titilayo</b>	
University/Country: <b>Adeleke University, Ede/Nigeria</b>	
Date Manuscript Received: <b>19/08/2020</b>	Date Review Report Submitted: <b>21/08/2020</b>
Manuscript Title: <b>Performance of inherent electrogens in benthic sediment mud at different pH conditions in microbial fuel cell</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: <b>96.08.2020--</b>	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <b>Yes</b>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <b>Yes</b>	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <b>Yes</b>	

## **Evaluation Criteria:**

**Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.**

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Nouns in the title should start with capital letters e.g Electrogens</b>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</b>

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Well written I was not able to spot any error in the body of the paper</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**