



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	2013_BMRJ_6587
Title of the Manuscript:	Lipolytic Activity and Molecular Characterization of Pseudomonas aeruginosa and Lysinibacillus sphaericus from domestic oil rich wastewater
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Title of the manuscript should be modified. The strain were identified using molecular methods, however the authors do not present molecular characterization of the strains. I suggest also to write ".... Pseudomonas aeruginosa and Lysinibacillus sphaericus strains isolated from...." Delete the first paragraph of the Introduction chapter - description of well known PCR and DNA sequencing techniques in this place is not a good idea. This chapter should focus lypolitic bacteria. section 3.1., 3.2. I would expect determination of a number of colony forming units as a parameter of bacterial growth, instead of increase in weight of bacteria. chapter 3.3. lines 163-170. As stated - most of the DNA sequencing reactions revealed multiple peaks, which strongly suggests that the authors did not work with pure cultures. If so, this would discredit the results presented in previous two chapters of the manuscript, i.e. growth of bacteria in wastewater and palm oil. In my opinion	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	identification of the all tested strains (at the genus level) should be an initial point of this study. line 168. The strains were classified to <i>P. aeruginosa</i> and <i>L. sphaericus</i> species based on the 99 % nucleotide sequence identity of the rDNA sequences. However, according to Drancourt et al (2000. J. Clin. Microbiol. 38:3623-3630) a 97 to 99% identity in 16S rRNA gene sequence is the criterion to identify an organism at the genus level and >99% identity - to the species level. lines 166, 168 - should be <i>Pseudomonas</i> sp. , <i>Bacillus</i> sp. Within the manuscript the Results and Discussion were combined into a single chapter. However section 3.5. contains distinguished Discussion section. The authors should decide about composition of the manuscript.	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Figures 1, 2, and 3 have not been cited in the text. They should be omitted. line 124. change " organisms" - to " strains" (change this throughout the text) Please combine data presented in Tables 5a and 5b into more concise form (Single Table). Lines 51-52. Although the bacterial isolates used in this study have been previously described, these data are not available (this section refers to PhD thesis).	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer