

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biochemistry, Genetics and Molecular Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJBGMB_91972
Title of the Manuscript:	Optimization of Amylase Production in Three Fungal Species
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.journalajbgb.com/index.php/AJBGMB/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The author isolated the amylase producing fungi strains using plate method, and then did the single factors experiments, studied the optimal incubation time, the temperature, pH, and carbon source for amylase production. The writing is logic, but the research is not prudent. There are several points the author could improve on. First, just using plate method to confirm which genera the strains belong to is not prudent. Second, the whole sets of single factor experiments share the common condition: pH5, 25 C, 1% starch. The result for this condition appeared in Figure 1 and Figure 2. The results for this same condition are significantly different. Third, 2% starch gave the best amylase activity for all strains. The reviewer was curious about whether there is an optimal starch concentration. Fourth, in Table 4, the author measured the optical density. What is the method the author used to measure optical density for fungi fermentation broth? What is the reason that the optical density was decreased with time going on? What is the original optical density of the medium?	
Minor REVISION comments		
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:	Liyan Chen
Department, University & Country	Kansas State University, USA