



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_44851
Title of the Manuscript:	MONITORING FUNGAL BIODEGRADATION OF LOW-DENSITY POLYETHYLENE [LDPE] FROM PLASTIC WASTES DUMP SITES USING FT-IR SPECTRA
Type of the 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: Either the manuscript title or the aim of the research should be re-framed in order to be in accordance with the methods and findings of the research. Aim and objectives: The aim, motivation, justification and research problem are either completely absent or vaguely presented Materials and methods: Sampling sites not clearly identified Sample collection did not represent standard microbiological sample collection. Procedure for determination of soil physical properties is completely missing Some of the methods described are incomplete (compare 73 -76 and 170 -179) Some procedures consist inconsistent information (see 94 -98) Results some of the data obtained have no procedures to back it up All the tables presented are not in standard form There is need for careful and appropriate use of these words: bond, bend, band Fig 4 need clear explanation Discussion Some discussions are out of the research findings (see 377-379) No conclusion and one can hardly deduce the significance of this research from its content	The adjustments based on the comments have been made and highlighted in yellow in the corrected manuscript The objectives have been revised as requested. In the methodology, the sampling sites have been written clearly Conclusion has been added to the write up Adjustments have been made to the methodology and result section to make it more clearer and explanatory
Minor REVISION comments	Need to review units and title of figures and tables	
Optional/General comments	Considering the subject matter of the article, environmental problems associated with PE and the experience the author (s) have in the course of the research, one would expect the authors to put forward a recommendation that will highlight the current challenges and guide further research.	



PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> Not applicable	Noted