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	**Research**

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 focuses on identifying the fungal strain that were present in a local beverage known as Zabo drink. Well I like this research in terms of local population. But that research raise several questions about the manufacturing and production authorities of the beverage.**	Zobo drink not Zabo drink
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	**The title suits well with the core of the study.**	Thank you
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.	**Methodology section should be added. The jump from the background and aim directly toward the findings of the study, can be enhanced if added which methodology was focused or brief explanation of which methods were followed for identification and characterization.**	Done
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	**The structure of the manuscript is alright.**	Okay
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.	**Introduction and methodology sections need to be improved. For a limited population, relevant to the study can be be more beneficiary of the study.**	Done
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	**The reference seems to be okay.**	Okay
Minor REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	Yeah the language is satisfactory and sound enough.	Okay
Optional/General comments	Just improve the abstract, add more detail in the introduction and material method sect	Done

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)*	