



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_43167
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE ALKYL SULPHATASE ACTIVITIES OF BACTERIA FOUND IN SOIL CONTAMINATED WITH DETERGENT IN ONDO 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	<p>1. There are a number of grammatical errors in the manuscript, see some examples below, note verb-noun agreement:</p> <p>LINE 11 – and biodegrading potentials of each of the bacterial isolates</p> <p>LINE 33 - ...supplies water</p> <p>The Soil functions as a medium for plant growth [1]. It purifies, stores and supplies water [2] and it influences distribution...</p> <p>LINE 35: Most plants requires a ...</p> <p>LINE 41 - Detergents is-are one of the major pollutants OR a detergent is ...</p> <p>LINE 45 – Remove “being” from the sentence</p> <p>LINE 47 – ... produced by some microorganism</p> <p>LINE 48 - ...the latter being...</p> <p>LINE 50 – this research therefore assesses...</p> <p>LINE 73 – The cell pellets at the base of the centrifugation tube was were collected...</p> <p>LINE 81 - ...was pipetted into...</p> <p>2. LINE 58 – REPETITION OF INFORMATION IN “COLLECTION OF SAMPLES”</p> <p>Isolation of Detergent Degrading Bacteria</p> <p>Isolation of detergent degrading bacteria from the soil samples was done by collecting the soil samples in sterile containers from the carwash parks; where the waste water effluent is being deposited. Serial dilutions were carried out on the soil samples. The serial diluted samples were inoculated onto minimal salt composition media supplemented with test surfactant.</p> <p>3. State the speed of centrifugation in your methodology – With centrifugation, it is customary to state the speed and time with temperature included as relevant. You have stated time but not speed.</p> <p>4. LINE 88 – Microsoft windows 7 is not a statistical package so does not need to be mentioned.</p> <p>5. LINE 93 – note spelling of “<i>Escherichia coli</i>”</p> <p>6. Note that all the Figures indicate OD at 600nm on the y-axes but your methodology states that OD was measured at 652nm (LINE 84). Consider revising this.</p> <p>7. Rename y-axes in your figures – “AST Activity (mM/min) at 600nm”</p> <p>(Note that the 600m is a measure of the wavelength of your spectrometer not the optical density)</p> <p>8. Remove the names of organisms within the figures, the figure title already states which organism is involved.</p> <p>9. Only three of the isolates mentioned in the conclusion.</p>	<p>Okay, they will be corrected.</p> <p>Okay, it will be corrected.</p> <p>Okay, it will be included.</p> <p>Okay, It will be removed.</p> <p>Okay, It will be corrected</p> <p>Okay, it will be revised.</p> <p>Okay, it will be renamed. Okay</p> <p>Okay, it will be removed.</p> <p>The three isolates mentioned were able to produce a remarkable potential for enzyme production as compared to others; thereby making them suitable candidates for detergent degradation.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	<p>The discussion is not robust enough for the excellent research work done.</p> <p>The discussion should be enhanced. The alkylsulphatase production of microorganisms in other similar research work carried out should be better highlighted. How do the organisms isolated and the enzyme production in this study compare with other studies? Have other studies also found <i>B. subtilis</i> to be the strongest producer of alkylsulphatase? What is the possible reason for the higher production levels observed in <i>Bacillus</i>?</p>	<p>Okay, this will be looked into.</p> <p>Okay.</p>
Optional/General comments	<p>An excellent study.</p>	<p>Thanks.</p>