Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_MRJI_56190**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Screening of Fungi Isolated from the Brazilian Restinga for Insecticidal Activity**
Type of the Article	**Original Research 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	This study investigated fifty-three fungal isolates for their biological activity against leaf-cutting ant workers via direct contact of the insects with fungi or fungal spores. Trichoderma showed the highest mortality and Trichoderma sp. isolate (TR1) showed the best results. In summary, the method is reasonable and the result is sufficient. There are some small problems here. 1. Results: Exposing Ants to Fungal Colonies, In this part, Ants were directly exposed to 53 fungal isolates, please show the mortality of each isolate use a figure or table. 2. Results: Exposing Ants to Fungal spores, same with above. 3. Results: extracts of isolates TR1, TR4, TR7 and TR10 were used in new tests to assess toxicity via ingestion, contact and exposure to volatile compounds. It is better to compare these results with a table so convenient for illustrate the results.	We thank the reviewer´s suggestion. 1. We believe that there is no need to show the mortality of each isolate. Data not showed here are those treatments that did not differ significantly from the control group. 2. Same as above. 3. A table was incorporated, as suggested.
Minor REVISION comments	1. "Among the 20 isolates tested, no Acremonium were re-isolated and just one Pestalotiopsis isolate was re-isolated" here, the number 20 is confusing. Should it be 53? 2. Table 2 is not clear. Like the last line-Number Recovered Fungi*/Ant.	1. The phrase was corrected 2. The table was improved
Optional/General comments	No	

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)*	