

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_124635
Title of the Manuscript:	SCREENING AND CHARACTERIZATION OF POTENTIAL FUNGI FROM ENVIRONMENTAL SAMPLES FOR EXTRACELLULAR PHYTASE PRODUCTION

Review Form 3

Type of the Article	Original
---------------------	----------

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The work finds lot of importance in terms of industrial applications of Phytase enzyme.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Comprehensive, however the key words are not catchy	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	OK	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Scientific and English corrections need to be made throughout the manuscript. 2. In the thermo stability study authors have mentioned about fungal protein, was it a cell-free protein extract or culture broth. If it was a cell free protein extract, how was the zone of inhibition formed. Cell free protein extract cannot have <i>in-vitro</i> inhibitory activity against phytin. 3. The authors have to make quantitative measurement of phytase and specific activity of the enzyme for both temperature treated and untreated samples to be more precise. 4. The methods used should be specified with relevant references to help the readers. 5. Numbering of the isolates mentioned in the text and Fig 5 & 6 are not matching. It is given as isolates 2, 3, 5, 10 & 11 in the text while in the fig caption it is given as 2, 3, 5, 11 & 12. 6. Three values are given for isolates 2 & 12 while for other samples only two values are given, however, only two figures are given for all the samples. The values are also differently mentioned for isolate 12. In one place it is given a 54.72, 39.89 and 54.7 µg/ml and in the fig caption it is shown as 9.66 and 9.88 µg/ml 7. What is the difference between Fig 2, 6 and Fig 8, 9 8. Page 6: the text "when the isolates ----- at 300, 400 and 500°C" should become 30, 40 and 50 °C 9. The figure caption should contain only the details of the figure not the explanation as it should appear in discussion 10. Interpretation of the results should be rewritten and made more clear to the readers. In the present state, it is highly confusing. 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :-	Sufficient	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English grammar should be improved throughout the article	
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	B. S. Gunashree
Department, University & Country	Mangalore University, India