

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_83203
Title of the Manuscript:	Screening, Isolation and Characterization of Amylase Producing Bacteria and optimization for Production of Amylase.
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.journaljamb.com/index.php/JAMB/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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	No clearcut advantage / purpose of this study. Only putative / fringe benefit was mentioned. The study is observational only. No structured abstract. Too much of illustration and graphical presentation. Not written in a way sought by scientific publications. Refernces section format is varying..not following any format. Lot of typographical errors. Lot of introductory remarks in 'Discussion'. There is no need of 'Figure 1' and also .Plate 2 which used the Jukes-Cantor model – a global uniformalising tool 9 (only few isolates taken in the manuscript). Correct the text accordingly. Plate 1 is not according to the caption given below and needs to be modified. Follow the format of the journal. No conflict of interest? All sections have to be abridged. Revise accordingly.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Manuscript is not line with the format. It appears that the manuscript is haphazardly written. Submlssion may be accepted only after all the queries are rebutted by submitting revised manuscript.	

Review Form 1.6

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	A. Balasubramaniam
Department, University & Country	Tamil Nadu Eterinary and Animal Sciences University, India