



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Biotechnology Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJI_37221
Title of the Manuscript:	ISOLATION, IDENTIFICATION AND CHARACTERIZATION OF CELLULASE FROM A BACTERIUM OBTAINED AT A SAW-MILL SITE IN ILE-IFE, NIGERIA
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 (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	Are there competing interest issues in this manuscript? Yes there are good competing interest issues in this manuscript	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>This paper presented very interesting pilot study on isolation, identification and characterization of cellulase from a bacterium obtained at a saw-mill site in ile-ife, nigeria. The author characterized in the present paper the cellulase with enviable physicochemical parameters from a 7 bacterium isolated from decaying sawdust heap. Isolated bacteria were screened for 8 cellulolysis using the Congo red plate method.</p> <p>The authors concluded in his study that nature is full of cellulolytic bacteria that could be exploited for applications in biotechnology such as hydrolysis of under-utilized lignocellulosic material such as sawdust, to glucose which can further act as feedstock for other value adding products.</p> <p>The paper is written very carefully and it is a well written paper. The reviewer recommends this paper for acceptance with the following change.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There are many irregularities in English in this paper, so it should be revised seriously. 2. Abstract is too long, It should be revised to summarized the study. 3. Discussion part is too weak, this should be revised 4. In general, tables and figures are poorly and not well presented and the figure caption does not provide sufficient information. This should be revised. 5. Please follow the journal requirement "guide for authors, Figure, tables, references,..." 6. Conclusion section It is too bulky. Make it concise form possibly with some numerical results. 7. Conclusions must be comprehensive and not written like a report. 8. It's very important if you added some news references from 2016-2017. 	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Fellah Mamoun
Department, University & Country	Mechanical Engineering Department, Abbes Laghrour University, Algeria