

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biotechnology and Genetic Engineering
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJBGE_130669
Title of the Manuscript:	Isolation and Identification of fungi producing amylase from locally made pap residue
Type of the Article	Original Research 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/>

Review Form 3

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The Research Article is outstanding Amylase are enzymes that catalyze the hydrolysis of glycosidic bonds present in starch to release simple sugars and produce different monomeric products. As explained pap processing waste have the potential to be used as substrate in the production of glucose and amylase by fungal isolates from pap processing waste.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is suitable.	
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.	he abstract of the article comprehensive and the results are good from a scientific standpoin .	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The structure of the manuscript is scientifically appropriate.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The research is ok. But it needs some straightforward corrections. The language needs improvements. Many sentences have strange wording that makes the manuscript difficult to read. The Material and Methods could be rewritten to be clear. The Material and Methods lack specific details about the Methods and their implications. The references must be unified according to the context of the journal.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language needs improvements. Many sentences have strange wording that makes the manuscript difficult to read.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The language needs improvements. Material and Methods not clear could be rewritten to be clear of experiment. Need be clear and detailed enough to let another researcher follow it and reproduce.	

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:	Alaa Akeel Alhosaene
Department, University & Country	Al-Furat Al-Awsat Technical University, Iraq