



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BMRJ_25837
Title of the Manuscript:	Novel Bacillus consortium for degradation of 2, 4- Dinitrotoluene: A xenobiotic compound
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Authors should rephrase the ABSTRACT. It is too lengthy. Authors should remove sections (Aim, place and duration of study, methodology, results and conclusion) in the Abstract. The abstract should be a short prose which includes all the activities of the above mentioned sections.	Abstract has been rephrased including all the activities as per the suggestions.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	In the Abstract section, 2,4-dinitrotoluene should be written in full when first used and then abbreviated in subsequent usage in the abstract. (see Line 11 where it is applied correctly). Rephrase Line 19; to read: "Bioremediation is a process of cleaning the harmful wastes with microbes or plants; it is one of the most..." Rephrase Line 29; to read: "or would not be able to complete the process". Rephrase Line 38 (We report the degradation of 2,4-DNT...); to read: "The present study investigates the degradation of 2,4-DNT..."	All the corrections have been incorporated in the manuscript.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		