



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	2014_BMRJ_15761
Title of the Manuscript:	Sourcing Starter Cultures for Parkia biglobosa Fermentation III: Preparation of Starter Cultures for Industrial Scale Fermentation
Type of the Article	Research paper

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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Shown as 2014_BMRJ_15761(M) with red letters. And as below: 1. The display of pictures needs to be adjusted. 2. The name of photo and table requires additional typing as figure.	1. The 'adjustment' that is needed was not specified. Is it terms of size or position of placement. 2. Normally, photos are designated 'Plates', while graphs are designated 'Figures'. Thus the authors have applied the standard practice in learned journals.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The abstract should put together as one. The usage way of number should be unified.	The authors complied with the template given for Abstract presentation. What the Reviewer meant by the term: 'The usage way of number should be unified', is not clear to the author.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Totally, this is a good paper for research to application in microbiology. But it should have more skilful to writings the paper.	The authors appreciate the acknowledgement of the relevance of the paper. However, the second sentence (But it should have more skilful to writings the paper), is rather 'ambiguous'. NB: The word "inocula" used in line 219 is correct, because it is the plural form of the word 'inoculum', the correct microbiology term.