



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Microbiology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_40780
Title of the Manuscript:	Screening and Characterization of Putative Probiotic Lactobacillus Strains from Honey Bee Gut (Apis mellifera)
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>)

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Please explain why only few genes (and how they were selected) (line 144....</b>The genes involved in pH and bile salt tolerances that were screened are shown in Table 1.) potentially involved in pH and bile salt tolerance were investigated. HSP (even sHsp), CtsR, FtsH.....are all stress responsive genes even involved in bile salt tolerance. Furthermore, it not clear why only the Histidine decarboxylase gene (ref. 19) was analysed. The hdc gene is involved in histamine production.....other BA producing genes could be used as well as BA production (not only histamine) is associated to pH tolerance. The Cpl gene as well, is only a piece of the Clp genes in LAB involved in stress tolerance.</p> <p><b>Table 7 and 16S LAB identification.</b> Please, consider that the differences in 16S within the L. plantarum group are really few. To distinguish between L. plantarum and L. paraplantarum a recA analysis should be performed. Otherwise the strains are suppose to be putative species identification.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Paper is, in general, well written (apart some physiological mistakes/grammatical errors). Experimental parts competently done, although authors should specify some choice.	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Giuseppe Spano</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Foggia, Italy</b>