



SDI Review Form 1.6

_*

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_36307
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF OPTIMIZATION OF CULTURAL PARAMETERS ON EXOBIOPOLYMER PRODUCTION BY MICROBIAL ISOLATES AND THEIR APPLICATION IN WASTEWATERS TREATMENT
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	1.Lines 7- 8: The sentence needs revision. The authors should avoid the 'of' repeats in the same sentence. 2. Lines18- 19: The sentence revised as' inorganic nitrogen sources required 0.50 and 0.30 g/l for AP4 and NB2 '. otherwise it was confusing. 3.Line 74: It was written as FTIR analyze was conducted but in Results and discussion part there was not anything about FTIR. 4. Line 94: '1m of each' may be corrected as '1 ml' or what? 5. Lines 161- 187: the authors stated what they did and the examples in literature but they did not discuss their results with the literature. For example, they may add a sentence like 'In this study the flocculation activity of individual or mixed microorganisms were similar or there was no change...ect. 6. Lines 161- 187: The article which was given below about the comparison of individual and mixed cultures is recommended to read. * GÜL Ü. D. and DÖNMEZ G. Application of mixed fungal biomass for effective reactive dye removal from textile effluents. Desalination and Water Treatment, 51:16-18, 3597-3603 (2013) 7. Line 192- 215: The authors should discuss the results of this study with others in literature. 8. In literature the unit 'mg/l' is preferred instead of 'ppm' 9. Line 455: Liu et al (2017) was come after Liu et al (2016) which was in line 465.	1. Lines 7-8: The revision is done 2. Line 18-19: The correction is effected for better clarity. 3. Line 74: The FTIR analysis and other characterizations is already reported in our previous publication. However, it has been removed. 4. Line 94: The error is corrected. Thanks 5. Lines 161-187: The discussion is done. 6. Lines 161-187: The suggested reference by the reviewer is very helpful. I am really grateful for this. 7. Lines 192-215: The discussion is done. 8. The unit ppm have been replaced with mg/L 9. Line 455: The correction is done.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		