



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	2014_BMRJ_15907
Title of the Manuscript:	Characterization and Phylogenetic Studies of Marine Bacteria Isolated from Sundarbans, Bangladesh
Type of the Article	Research

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	2.5 Phylogenetic Characterization should be revised, a lot of principal element are missing like the enzyme used for PCR mix, thermal cyclers used, amplification condition, type of tree constructed, etc Table 2, the key should be placed at the bottom of the table, not above with the legend. The phylogenetic tree (Fig. 2) should be edited to remove special characters and the accession number should be in parenthesis. The references should be formatted to the journal style; standard for abbreviation should be used.	All the corrections were making as per reviewer comments. Please see the corrected manuscript. Table 2, the key is placed at the bottom of the table. The phylogenetic tree is edited to remove special characters and the accession number is in parenthesis. Yes, we have re write references as it required by the journal guidelines.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The unit for hour is h not hr Misspelling should be corrected like 149, 219 The right degree sign should be used and consistent There should be space between figures and units. 16S rDNA not 16S rDNA, should be corrected	All the corrections were making as per reviewer comments. Please see the corrected manuscript.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		