

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_77126
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARATIVE EFFECTIVENESS OF WILD AND COMMERCIAL STRAINS OF LACTIC ACID BACTERIA STARTER CULTURE DURING BACKSLOPING FOR YOGHURT PRODUCTION
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:

<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) The concept of the manuscript is okay but part of the abstract need to be re-written as i have pointed them out on the reviewed manuscript. (2) The justification for the study is yet to be clearly stated. (3) Long use of sentences with less meaning is one of the errors in this work. (4) The introduction is okay, but does not flow as expected. It has to be sequential. (5) The title should be changed because there is no statistical analysis to any significant difference or not. The study did not use any standard statistical tools for comparison as the title stated. The word 'comparative studies' will be applicable in the title if there is statistical justification for this. (6) The author (s) should clarify the number of water samples taken and the sources of variation in the sampling of water and fish (7) The author (s) should act or react to the comments made within text (8) Some citations were not referenced. And the references section were just copy and paste. The author did not follow any standard method or guidelines for referencing from the journal. 	
Minor REVISION comments	Minor revision like word spellings as I have highlighted them in the reviewed paper.	
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>	

Review Form 1.6

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ogbonne, Fabian Chinedu
Department, University & Country	Nigerian Institute for Oceanography and Marine Research, Lagos, Nigeria