



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>British Microbiology Research Journal</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_BMRJ_4860
Title of the Manuscript:	Characterization of Lactic acid bacteria from raw milk samples of Cow, Goat, Sheep, Camel and Buffalo with special elucidation to lactic acid production
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	L35-38: Is this the only difference? The authors could easily add some additional properties, just to say the different parameters they used during their own experimental work. L38-39: this is like saying two times the same (microbiological quality is influence by the initial flora of the raw milk) - general quality? shelf life? or mention factors that can influence that initial flora of the raw milk affecting the quality of the milk. Adjust accordingly. L40: This statement is not true. Adjust. L49-56: This paragraph should be rewritten. Reference for the definition of lactic acid bacteria (can be abbreviated to LAB in the rest of the manuscript); I miss cheese, yoghurt (I would not include this in fermented milks), fermented meat ...; I also not agree with the traditional characteristics of fermented foods. A lot of fermented foods are not so traditional anymore and are subjected to high quality and sanity standards. However, if the authors refer to local practices or the situation in developing countries, this might be true, but then this should be put in this context like e.g. the absence of refrigeration, fermentation offering a way to increase the shelf life of the fermented food product for a certain period of time. I also miss a part on the objectives of this study. The aims are partly described in the abstract, but this only mention what the authors did. It is important to mention why the authors did this research. e.g. coupling to L103 - why only interest in the strong acid producers? Why also analysing milk from five different animals? Why not a	Line corrected Line corrected Adjusted Line corrected Line corrected



SDI Review Form 1.6

	deeper investigation of the milk of one type of animal? The flora of Cow's milk for example has already been investigated very thoroughly. L59: The number of samples analysed should be mentioned. L67-69: Can be removed as not relevant. Nowhere else in the manuscript the group code I to V is mentioned. L70-71: How can Gram staining be used to ascertain purity of an isolate? L73-75: Check English usage. The fact that sequencing was done for identification should also be included in the material and methods section. The same for all other experiments that have been performed e.g. L92-98: these are no result but a description of methods that have been applied. Results: How many isolates were initially obtained from the total of samples and how many from each individual sample? How many of this initial number were selected on the basis of Gram staining and catalase production for further analysis? L83: What do the authors mean with 'efficiently'? What criterion (e.g. a minimal pH drop?) was used to select certain isolates? The fact that HPLC was used should be mentioned in the material and methods section. L103: What is considered to be 'high acid production'? How many isolates were selected? This should be stated. L104: at least one, means that more than one is also an option: If interested in high acid producers (L103), and given the fact that the	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	three goat isolates seemed to be different (morphology, growth properties), why not then analysing all three of them? L106-108: It is quite confusing to know which isolates have been tested for what parameters. Given the very low similarity values of the 16S sequences and the fact that for closely related LAB species the 97% rule is even considered to be low (the cut-off for species delineation has been adjusted to 98.7% (Stackebrandt and Ebers, 2006)), the species designations cannot be considered valid. Second, this threshold value cannot be applied to analyse partial sequences, but I cannot infer from the manuscript whether or not the full 16S was sequenced. regarding the conclusion: only one sentence regarding the goat isolates can be considered of value. Conclusion should be rewritten in context of objectives which also need to be stated.	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	L12: I would suggest to replace this first sentence with 'A conventional culture approach for strain isolation from raw milk samples was performed, followed by ...' L14: ... to ferment different sugars with the production of lactic acid ... L20: NaCl (see also L74); were studied for all isolates L21-22: here I would mention what molecular techniques were used for the characterization and identification of the isolates L36: There is a wide variety of ... L42: the same is observed for cow, goat, ... L44: ... as a milk component ... L46-47: This last sentence is not really relevant. L70: ... pure isolates were maintained on MRS ... L73-74: catalase, sugar not need to be capitalized; ... were observed for all isolates. L76: remove 'the maximum' ; ... by measuring the pH drop after 24 hours of incubation. Table 2: I would replace Table 2(B). Morphological ... with just 'Table 2(continued)'.	
---	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments		
--	--	--