

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_77491
Title of the Manuscript:	Keratinophilic Fungi in Urban waste and Cattle field soil of Kanpur, India
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:

(<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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>Title of this manuscript is not clear at all. It doesn't hold full meaning of the whole paper. So, it is better to re-shape it again. What it tells about readers is not clear.</p> <p>In my suggestion the title of this manuscript might be:  <b>Identification of Keratinophilic Fungi in Urban waste and Cattle field soil of for environmental pollution management Kanpur, India</b></p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The abstract section of this manuscript lacks major finding, conclusion and research gap or recommendations. Therefore, this section requires critical revision for authors.</li> <li>Statement of problem section of this manuscript too shallow. So, it requires careful revision. Unless it is not clear for readers.</li> <li>The objective of this manuscript is not known. So, it is better to specify clearly as possible.</li> <li>Upon checking this manuscript I noticed that some old citations are there and it is better to update them with the most recent one.</li> <li>Under the result section it is better to update figures by different colors with respective types of fungi</li> <li>Reference style is not consistent throughout the whole manuscript. For example under inside citations it looks like APA style. But, the appendix section seems like numbering style. This is not consistent style. It is highly recommended to the authors either of one. It is not possible to apply both style together.</li> </ul>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>The manuscript needs to be edited for its English. There are numerous instances of improper grammar and sentence structure.</p>	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>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><i>Mulugeta Hadaro</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>Mizan-Tepi University, Ethiopia</i></b>