

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Biotechnology Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJI_98501
Title of the Manuscript:	ISOLATION AND IDENTIFICATION OF FUNGAL STRAINS FROM FRESH AND SMOKED FISH FROM THE SASSANDRA RIVER IN CÔTE D'IVOIRE
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.journalbjournal.com/index.php/BJI/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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The author isolated and identified fungal strains contaminating fresh and smoked fish from the Sassandra River in Côte d'Ivoire. The study is interesting but needs some work. Suggestions are given below</p> <p>Section 1 Introduction: (1) too short and need more relevant information (2) there are some grammatical mistakes and some sentence structures are also not good.</p> <p>Section 2.1 Sampling: (1) What kind of aseptic conditions were maintained after sampling? This point needs explanation. (2) There were a total of one hundred and eight samples of fresh and processed fish. how many samples were of fresh fish, and processed fish. Please mention their numbers.</p> <p>Section 2. Material and methods: (1) how many batches of samples? (2) For Mold Isolation, Whose methodology was adopted? reference?</p> <p>Section 3.1 Results: (1) There is no need for Table 1. The data in table 1 should be adjusted in the text. (2) were there any standard/reference strains of fungus for comparison/verification?</p> <p>Section 3.2: Discussion is very poor and needs improvement.</p> <p>Overall, the article contains several grammatical errors.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Iqra Naeem
Department, University & Country	Institute of Food Science and Nutrition, Bahauddin Zakariya University, Pakistan