

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_103876
Title of the Manuscript:	Isolation and characterization of Lactobacillus strains with probiotic potential from dairy products
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:

(<https://www.journalajee.com/index.php/AJEE/editorial-policy> )

### 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)
<p><b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</li> <li>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</li> <li>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</li> <li>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The manuscript is important for scientific community</li> <li>2. The title of the article is suitable but it does not state the setting.</li> <li>3. The abstract is comprehensive but the study design is not.</li> <li>4. I think subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</li> <li>5. I think the manuscript is scientifically correct.</li> <li>6. The references are not recent. The references are numbered in the work but on the reference page it is not numbered.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor REVISION</b> comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</li> </ol>	Yes it is suitable for scholarly communication. The methodology should be written in past tense.	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	The spelling of yoghurt are not consistent throughout the work. Some of the corrections are in RED ink.	

### 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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> I don't think so.</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Yakubu Mary Aricha</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Ahmadu Bello University, Nigeria</b>