

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_84605
Title of the Manuscript:	Xylanase-producing fungi diversity in the soil of Jeddah, Saudi Arabia
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.journalajarr.com/index.php/AJARR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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	<p>This paper shows assess of the diversity of xylanase-producing fungi in the soil of Jeddah, Saudi Arabia, as well as the xylanase-producing potential of the isolated fungi. The work is sound, the results convincing, and the topic is of interest to readers of the journal but the narrative needs to be improved, my comments are below.</p> <p>The most critical points refer to further detailed methods section and the need for proper statistical evaluation of the data.</p> <p>There is no information on normal distribution. and number of biological replicates for the experiments. In addition, how many times were the experiments independently carried out? This information must be included.</p> <p>Please number lines. Continuous line numbering is most useful for easy reviewing.</p> <p>The language may be checked for its improvement.</p> <p>p1, line 12, ccorrect the space between the words.</p> <p>P2, Material and method, line 4, line 12, ccorrect the space between the words.</p> <p>P2, Material and method, line 7, Where was the cool place to store the samples?</p> <p>p3, "Isolation of xylanase-producing fungi from soil samples by dilution plate assay "section, why 30 mg/ml Was used?</p> <p>p3, "Identification of the isolated fungal species" section How the relative density (%) of each species was calculated?</p> <p>p4, why 430 nm was used?</p> <p>p4, which version of SPSS was used?</p> <p>p4, Why LSD method was used? What control in this study?</p> <p>p4, Do the data have normal distribution?</p> <p>A Figure of fungus grown on a plate must be added to the materials and methods.</p>	<p>The manuscript has been revised in light of the reviewers' comments. The corrections have been highlighted in the revised version of the manuscript.</p> <p>The revised manuscript includes all of the information required by the reviewer for statistical analysis.</p> <p>The revised manuscript has been number-lined.</p> <p>As suggested by the reviewer, the manuscript has been checked for language improvement. It has been revised, as well as the grammatical and typographical errors have been corrected.</p> <p>p1, line 12, corrected</p> <p>p2 line 4, line 12, corrected.</p> <p>p2, The soil samples were kept in the car with the air conditioning set to the coldest setting until they were transported to the lab.</p> <p>The streptomycin was used at 30 µg/ml in the xylan agar medium. There was a typing error. we have corrected it in the revised manuscript.</p> <p>p3, The relative density (RD) of each species was also calculated as a percent of the total count by the following formula:</p> <p>$RD (\%) = SS/TS \times 100$; where, SS = the total colony count of a species from a site and B = the sum of the total colony count of all species from a site. The text has been included in the revised manuscript.</p> <p>p4, There was a mistake. It should be 480 nm. A correction has been made, and a related reference has been cited.</p> <p>p4, SPSS version 20 was used.</p> <p>p4, only the data of xylanase activity was statistically analyzed (LSD) using SPSS (version 20). In this, <i>A. candidus</i> was included as a control. This fungus was isolated from the Jeddah soil by the first author and has been reported as a potential xylanase producer. The text has been included in the revised manuscript. and the figure has been revised in accordance with it.</p> <p>p4, The data has a normal distribution.</p> <p>As suggested by the reviewer, the figure of fungi grown on plates and in liquid medium has been included in the material and method section.</p>
Minor REVISION comments		

Review Form 1.6

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