



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Microbiology Research Journal</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BMRJ_29861
Title of the Manuscript:	Exploring Textile Dye form Microorganisms, an Eco-friendly Alternative
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	• Language needs revision for grammar and sentences structure. • Which biochemical tests were used in bacterial identification?	• Language and sentence structures were carefully revised. • After incubation on nutrient agar media at 37°C for 24 hours, colony characteristics of the isolates were observed. Pure culture of the bacterial isolates was subjected to Gram staining and biochemical characterization such as oxidase, catalase, coagulase, citrate utilization, sugar utilization, starch hydrolysis, gelatin hydrolysis, motility, indole production, urease production, methyl red and voges-proskauer tests to identify the isolates. Identification was performed according to the standard protocol of Cappuccino and Sherman (2005). -----But this section was intentionally omitted because none of the bacterial isolates found in the study was capable of producing pigments, hence evaluated as unimportant in respect to the research objective and discarded.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	• Bacterial scientific name even in fig. should be written in <i>italic font</i>. • References should be updated to 2016.	• The scientific names were carefully checked. • References have been updated.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		