

BPI Review Form 070520

Book Name:	Research Perspectives of Microbiology and Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_1726
Title of the Manuscript:	Characterization of Psychrotrophic Molds in Indigenous Fermented Dairy Products
Type of the Article	Book Chapter

BPI Review Form 070520

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(If agreed with the reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. Authors must write his/her feedback here)</i>
Is the manuscript important for the scientific community? Please write a few sentences explaining your answer	This study has established the bases for future large-scale investigations of PsychrotrophicMoldsfrom Fermented Dairy Products. I am enthusiastic about the data, the results, and the authors' approach, but I find some problems with the manuscript that must be corrected before the paper can be considered for publication, which I'm going to mentions below.	
Is the title of the article suitable? Do you have any alternative Title in your mind?	The title is suitable	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? If your answer is No, please provide suggestions	The abstract is partially comprehensive and I find some problems with it. Forexample there is no statements describing the background and objectives of the study at the beginning of the abstract. The abstract simply start with methodology. So it needs further improvement to be comprehensive.	
Do you think the English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications? If your answer is No, please provide suggestions	It is suitable but still it need some modifications.	
Please provide your comments regarding the appropriateness of different sections of the manuscript.	Scientific names should be written in full when you indicate them in the text for the first time (start from abstract). The introduction section requires modification and should be more focused on PsychrotrophicMolds. The methodology parts especially sample collections, isolations and characterizations needs clear producers to be described. Is it possible to confirm the aforementioned fungi only using phenotypicpicture? The 18S rRNA analysis part is not complete. The details of DNA extraction, PCR condition, purification, library preparation, and also data handling and bioinformatics are missing. I don't understand the importance of removing molecular techniques Figure/s or picture/s.	
Do you think that the references in the manuscript are proper, recent and sufficient? If you have any suggestions, please write here.	Majority of the references are old and require an updates. But its properness depend up on the journals on which the manuscript are going to be published.	

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:	Guta Dissasa
Department, University & Country	Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia