Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_ARRB_54733**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Physicochemical characteristics of fungal xylanases and their potential for biobleaching of kraft and non-wood pulps**
Type of the Article	**Minireview 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:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	The authors' manuscript (minireview) contain useful information that is very meaningful and interesting to some biotechnology readers. The manuscript also presents a table summarizing information for these readers to easily understand. The topic itself is appropriate for "Annual Research & Review in Biology", however, the present manuscript has not yet completed. Therefore, I recommended this minireview needs the following minor revisions: 1) The unit of weight that appears in the fourth sentence (The most --- water) from the top in "INTRODUCTION" section should be united in tons (it is difficult to understand if tonnes and cubic meters are mixed). 2) If the serial number (NBRC10058 or ATCC10058) of the preservation institution is known for the fungus names described listed in Table 1, the authors should list those number next to the microorganism name.	We are grateful for the analysis of our work and the valuable suggestions provided to improve the quality of the manuscript (minireview). Our responses to the comments are listed below. 1) We corrected and rewrote the paragraph. 2) ATCC or NBRC of the fungi listed in the table are not reported in the articles, only the deposit number of the gene sequence of the ITS region in the NCBI or deposit code in the preservation institution. we found only deposit code for these 4 fungi (*Aspergillus flavus* (MF372379); *Aspergillus fumigatus* (RP04); *Aspergillus niveus* (RP05); *Penicillium crustosum* (KM065878). Because, most fungi were isolated from the environment of their own country by researchers. therefore, the table will continue without this information, only with the names of the fungi. we found only deposit code for these fungi.
Optional/General comments		

SDI 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)*	