

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Biotechnology Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJI_126497
Title of the Manuscript:	Characterization And Identification Of Fungi In Hibiscus Sabdariffa (Zobo) Drink Produced And Hawked In Eket Metropolis, Nigeria
Type of the Article	

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 manuscript is important to the community because the information it provided is very essential to local communities where this cheap local drink is common and often consumed. I like the manuscript because it brought our attention to a common local drink but dislike the manuscript because it lacked better details and is also supposed to encompass bacterial study.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable but should be rearranged as 'Identification and Characterization-----'	
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.	The abstract is not comprehensive enough; there is supposed to be the addition of some points as corrected in the manuscript.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Some of the subsections were not properly written e.g Materials and methods	
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.	Scientifically, the manuscript is correct but not robust. It lacks technicalities that could make it robust.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Some of the refernces are recent and sufficient but some references needs to be updated.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	It is moderately suitable.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript needs to be worked on so as to bring out the beauty of the work. The methods needs to be well spelt out.	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	