



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>British Microbiology Research Journal</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013 BMRJ 4220
Title of the Manuscript:	FERMENTATION PRODUCTS OF A β-MANNANASE-PRODUCING BACTERIA INHIBITS SELECTED POULTRY BORNE PATHOGENS
Type of the Article	Research Paper

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 7 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: Review Comments

	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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. Abstract summarized the paper and well organized, it is accomplished by proper results and contributions, and, mostly motivates the work. Perhaps the presentation of some of the resulted output lack of proper presentation 2. All descriptions clear and the tables and figures well explained. The research contributions as significant and the approach clearly explained and well arranged. 3. The author justifies each of the points made. The methods, experiments, and conclusions are mostly correct, robust, comprehensive and sensible. 4. The research properly ground in the literature and appropriate theory to sustain the arguments. But requires more updated articles to be included 5. The authors expressed the limitations of the research but in a limited approach. So extra efforts to make it manifested in the writeup 6. The authors performed an incomplete analysis and drawn insightful conclusions and managed with limited effort to described his or her future research plans. But unfortunately it is not clear in some areas where the research described in this article will lead and what the next step will be. I suggest little effort can move it positive towards proper output. So use the results to	I will slightly review the presentation. However, there is scanty information on this work, and i believe that more work should be done using this as a template. Thanks for the commendation. I look forward to more updated articles. I am going to do more of research into this study in my post Doctoral research. Your contributions are noted for future work.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	strength the output of the work and use the graphs to support the argument. 7. Authors conclusion significant and it is just a rehash of the paper. It provide insights and leaves the reader look forward to the research domain. This suggests professionalism in the way of presentation. So no further comments on conclusion. 8. To my experience with publications I can see it is adequate to the level for the publication. 9. The author's writing style is not too "dense" and makes sense. It keeps the reader's interest to some extent courage and style is deemed appropriate.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Methodology need to focus on proper explanation and support. Still is not clear on which method is compared to use the analysis	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Material of the article is good and the result is acceptable. It requires more additional references of year 2011 I can conclude from fig 3 and fig 4 more than it is mentioned. As it looks that the Percentage inhibition of <i>Shigella alkalescens</i> by fermentation products of mannanase producing bacteria could be compared with the Percentage inhibition of <i>Klebsiella oxytoca</i> by fermentation of mannanase varying from higher percentile with an mean equivalent to	