



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British MicrobiologyResearch Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BMRJ_29815
Title of the Manuscript:	Screening and Characterization of Biosurfactant Producing Bacteria from Soil Samples in Ogun-State, 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	- Title is ".....soil samples inOgun-State, Nigeria.", it might be ".....soil samples ofOgun-state, Nigeria." instead. - In abstract, Aims line 4 "e.t.c." has to be replaced "etc." - In abstract, Methodology line 3 "biochemical" has to be replaced "biochemical tests". - In abstract, Results line 1 apparently there are some gross calculations problems "46 isolates (17.4%) showed beta-hemolytic activity, 39 (84.8%) isolates were positive for oil spreading test, 33 (84.6%)". It is confusing if $46=17.4\%$, how come $39=84.8$ and $33=84.6$. - Introduction need to be reconsidered and rephrased. Sentences are repeated in first two paragraphs. With respect to classification of biosurfactants, it is explained thrice under the heading of introduction. - In Materials and Methods, under heading 2.2, sentence is incomplete. - Same mistake repeated again and again in Materials and Methods as well as Results and Discussion section, when author want to mention a method described by "someone", sentence must contain the name and then the reference. One cannot leave sentence incomplete with reference in the bracket. As reported by [22] is a wrong sentence. Write down as reported by name of the scientist and then give reference [22].	Disagree Noted Noted Total of 264 isolates were gotten from SABC and THDC. The result of the haemolytic activity test on blood agar showed that 46 (17.4%) produced beta haemolysis, 58 (22.0%) produced gamma haemolysis and 160 (60.6%) organisms produced alpha haemolysis, 46 isolates were the only beta haemolytic isolates that were further screened to 39 using oil spreading test etc. See manuscript Noted Noted Noted



SDI Review Form 1.6

	8. The use of terminology “blasting” is not a scientific term. BLAST is a software and use of software is not blasting. 9. On page 13, there is a sentence, “Ability of the cells that can produce biosurfactant to adhere to hydrocarbon (bath assay) was not in accordance with the work of [32]”, I could not understand as it was perfectly in accordance. Kindly check it again.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The Gel picture for 16 S ribosomal RNA gene sequencing is not very clear, terminologies are not clearly explained and caption can be elaborated to explain the results of the gel properly.	Noted
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	There are several grammatical mistakes which could be corrected easily through reading it word by word. Otherwise, I would appreciate the scientific work done. Data collection and statistical analysis is done perfectly, but few comments in the discussion section could easily be avoided to improve the overall message of the research conducted and manuscript prepared.	Noted