



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_24803
Title of the Manuscript:	CLASSICAL IDENTIFICATION, 16S rDNA SEQUENCING, AND MOLECULAR CHARACTERIZATION OF BACILLUS SPECIES FROM CONVENIENCE FOODS
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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1) Overall: The English language of the manuscript should be deeply reviewed. The written English must be carefully revised in order to improve understanding the data and results of the manuscript. 2) Introduction: Information about Bacillus characteristics in the first paragraph must be referenced. The only reference appears only in line 35. Paragraphs 2 and 3 in the Introduction report about the health problems related to the food contamination. All the information can be summarized, since the study directly addressed the use of different microorganisms identification techniques and not necessary the health problems. Lines 92-93: Delete "The results from both methods.... This information is not a objective maybe a justification for test methodology. 3) No hypothesis was presented in the manuscript. What is the hypothesis? 4) Methodology Sample collection: Justify why these foods have been tested? It contains carbohydrates, proteins?	Language reviewed. Done. Done. Effected. Included in last paragraph of introduction. They are farinaceous (starchy) products.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Classical identification: Lines 117-118: what were the methods used to test fermentation of carbohydrates, catalase, coagulase and motility? 5) Results More information in Plate 1 should be provided. Which sample? Table 1. The species presents in classical methods and 16S sequencing is correct? As a result the authors indicated a discrepancy of 3 in 9, but ribos D, G, H, J and L also showed differences. The edition of all figures is very poor. No statistical analyses were presented. No results about biochemical analysis were presented. The results must be rewritten with more detail. 6) Discussion: this section must be improved. Please, check the discussion item, some parts of discussion seems more like the results presentation (See line 213-217).	Ability of the isolates to ferment a wide variety of sugars such as lactose, glucose, arabinose etc., was tested for. Catalase, coagulase and motility tests were additional biochemical tests done A key has been added below the plate. Only isolates/strains that did not fall under the same genus or group were used to determine discrepancies. Edited. Not applicable. Done. Revised.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		