

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

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	This article discusses fungal contamination in a local beverage, highlighting health concerns and recommending good hygiene practices in beverage production. However, the authors should be more precise in conducting and presenting their experiments.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes.	
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.	There is no need to present the dilution for microbial counts that are scientifically reported as log CFU/ml. In addition, the last few sentences of discussion are unnecessary.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No, the materials and methods section is incomplete as it lacks the details about chemicals and equipment used.	
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.	- Enumeration of yeast and mold should be conducted by spread plate technique and plates should be incubated at 25 degree Celsius for 5 days. - Microbial counts need to be presented as log CFU/ml.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Figure captions should be more comprehensive.	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kanokwan Tandee
Department, University & Country	Maejo University, Thailand