SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	**British Microbiology Research Journal**
Manuscript Number:	**2013_ BMRJ 4218**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Screening and identification of mannanase producing fungi isolated from selected agricultural wastes**
Type of the Article	**Research Paper**

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:
(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

- This form has total 7 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.

SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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	I reviewed two BMRJ manuscripts (nos 4218 and 4221), which show the isolation of mannolytic fungi and bacteria, respectively, isolated from same sources (agrowastes). These manuscripts seem to be submitted by the same research group, and methodologies of both studies are quite similar, and almost same in some cases. Hence I recommend the authors and the editor to combine both manuscripts to publish as a full length article. This is I think important to keep the journal quality, and also useful to make the articles more attractive for journal readers. Ratio of mannolytic isolates/total culturable bacteria should be shown, because it is of interest for journal readers. Phylogenic identification of the isolates should be examined based on ribosomal DNA sequence which is recommended to submit in international database such as Genbank, EMBL, or DDBJ. It is essential to compare isolates' enzyme activity to known mannolytic species. Several pathogenic species were isolated as mannolytic strains. Are they useful for applications to feed or prebiotics?	

Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer