



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_36435
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF MICROBIAL AVAILABILITY AND LINKAGES TO THE PHYSICOCHEMICAL QUALITY OF NATURAL AND DETERIORATED RUBBER LATEXES
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	Introduction Organize sentence "However, based on the seasonal effects, clone and the state of the soil..." so it can be in the same line. Organize sentence "The latex from rubber is a vital material in the automobile industry as it is used in the manufacture of tyre, car bumpers, seats etc." so it can be in the same line. Would it be possible to enhance the quality of Figure 1? Put a dot after "spp". Change "Holst et al. (1998) has studied to have studied." Change – Materials to Material. Could the authors provide a better picture to substitute Figure 2? Where is the reference of Figure 2 in the text? In 2.3 change l g to 1 g, 30 ml to 30 mL (including all the other "ml" in the manuscript), HNO₃ to HNO₃. Change 37 °C to 37 °C (including other °C along the manuscript). Results and discussion Why do the authors write about Table 3 instead of the numerical order (1st, 2nd, 3rd....)? Change figure 3 to Figure 3 (including other figures	Corrected Corrected Effectuated "Materials" is proper and is always used in articles. Figure 2 was taken with the author's camera in the rubber estate and needs no reference. Corrections effectuated Noted and effectuated Noted Effectuated Effectuated

	along the manuscript) and also table to Table. Put a space between “DRL3: Three weeks deteriorated rubber latex and 3.3 Heterotrophic fungal counts” Put a “.” After “at 95% confidence interval” Why do the authors put “3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION” only present results and then “4. DISCUSSION”? In general the Results section is too long, would it be possible to make it shorter? I would eliminate Figures 6 and 7. Put a “.” After “organic nitrogen compounds such as amino acids”. Conclusion Please be aware that repeat results are not conclusions. Please re-think about the 2nd paragraph. Change “this work could serve...” to this study...	Corrected Noted Noted Effected
Minor REVISION comments	Abstract Change ufc/ml for UFC/mL (please check 1st the journal recommendation) Please check if the journal recommends: <i>et al.</i>, or <i>et al.</i>	Effected
Optional/General comments		