

**Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Microbiology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_85810
Title of the Manuscript:	Screening of Selected Soil Environments of Jos North Local Government Area for Lipase-Producing Fungi
Type of the 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.journaljamb.com/index.php/JAMB/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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The paper highlights on the lipolytic activity of fungi from soil samples collected around Nigeria. However the author failed to detail out a concise</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The reason for the site / sampling point was chosen; whats special about the sampling site</li> <li>2) The objective of the study is not clear and needs more depth. Such as why this sites were studied, very small number of fungi were recovered ( why the numbers are reduced), are the sampling meant to be grown in mesophilic or thermophilic temperature range</li> <li>3) Details on weather and was the site revisited to have a clear picture of the lipolytic activity over a period of time were not included.</li> <li>4) A map of the site is needed to see the distance between each site and any speciality of the site</li> <li>5) The introduction and discussion of the manuscript is considerably lacking literature review and author should refer to other studies to argue why this particular study is unique.</li> <li>6) The study is very straight forward it needs more optimisation such as SDS page to detect the protein size, and the author should be able to compare to other research hence forth I recommend the author to resubmit with the above suggestions taken into consideration.</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Leelatulasi Salwoom</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University Putra Malaysia, Malaysia</b>