

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

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (If agreed with the reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. Authors must write his/her feedback here)
Is the manuscript important for the scientific community? Please write a few sentences explaining your answer	Yes it is, but the write up should have life by writing in simple and plain language and finally be proofread	
Is the title of the article suitable? Do you have any alternative Title in your mind?	The title is quite oky	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? If your answer is No, please provide suggestions	The abstract is well written but should be revised by complying to the comments for example The problem statement and the methods used in this study should have been included, the general conclusion and the recommendation of the study should be clearly stated. What gap has the study left for upscaling be included.	
Do you think the English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications? If your answer is No, please provide suggestions	It needs improvement, grammar check and lastly the paper must be proofread to rectify some typos and errors, keep sentences short and simple Scientific paper must communicate to the readers in a concise manner without using ambiguous word. Readers must get the meaning conveyed in the report. Use simple language and method of communication	
Please provide your comments regarding the appropriateness of different sections of the manuscript.	The manuscript needs revision especially the contextualization of the data should be well balance. The findings in this study must centrally dissolve the argument other researchers recently found. The results must be fully explained and provide evidence why they are like that, and what brought the deviation and must be scientifically backed up.This section needs to be reworked, and be written in brief, just state the key issues and bring your discussion at the centre by debating why your findings are like that? They are similar and contrary to whose study. And why is that so? Could you results be different if you had used different methods? How special is your study? Is it filling the gap in the literature Your data presentation either in tables, figures must be well organised and articulated. Follow my comments when revising.	
Do you think that the references in the manuscript are proper, recent and sufficient? If you have any suggestions, please write here.	The reference are broad and current however, there is one reference which is too old	

BPI Review Form 070520

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:	Tijoy Lowore
Department, University & Country	Lilongwe University of Agriculture and Natural Resource, Malawi