



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	2013_BMRJ_8224
Title of the Manuscript:	Improved Cultural Conditions for Methionine Accumulation in Submerged Cultivation of <i>Bacillus cereus</i> S8
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 <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	Excellent scientific work for publication by the results and conclusions obtained. Line 31: should read: The Aims of this study was Line 39: Slant at 4 ° C (Specify: every.....months it should make a new culture). Line 43: It does not say as the seed culture medium and fermentation medium were sterilized. Line 220: Could you expand a little more conclusions, emphasizing: Conclusions of 66/76/85/92/97/103/109. And not to mention future studies or research.	Thank you. Line 31: Corrected. Line 39: Corrected. Line 43: sterile seed medium- The word sterile indicates that it was sterilized. Line 46: Corrected- sterile fermentation medium. Line 220: Corrected Noted.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Missing some details to consider for publication	Not clear as to which details
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Fulfilling the assessments made, it would be possible its publication.	