



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	The paper describes the screening for lipolytic bacterias from domestic wastewater. The initial experiments for screening were good, but the second part, are not satisfactory for publication. I have several questions about experimental design which I think will improve the paper. 1- The abstract did not describe the paper in general. The conclusion is missing. You don't need to put the name of BLAST, NCBI or HPLC in this section. Please rewrite the abstract section. 2- Which lipolytic compounds are present in this wastewater? Since you used soap, I supposed that the majority of oil or fat was lost. 3- Please explain the source of bacteria. They were recovering from liquid or solid portion of wastewater? 4- Why the authors used different cell concentrations for each media – 0.1mL for wastewater and 10mL for palm oil? The cell number used for each bacteria was the same? If you want to compare isolates and culture media you should at least maintain the same inoculum. 5- The growth in different media was performed with or without shaking? Please add on MM section 6- Why the authors used 90% palm oil? Is not higher concentration? Lipases can act on oil-water interface and this concentration seems weird for me. 7- Why the authors did not measure lipase activity? If you want to search a good lipolytic microorganism,	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	you should measure the enzyme activity. 8- If the authors observed phosphate could increase the weight in wastewater culture, why did not add this compound in palm oil? Seems obvious for me evaluate this question. Or add some concentration of wastewater on palm oil medium. 9- Please put in different sections Results and Discussion. The authors added some results in the Discussion section. It was very confuse: (a) please remove lines 164-167 in 3.3 section; 197-208 in 3.5 section; 266-270 in 3.5 section; please remove lines 213-218 – this sentence did not increase the discussion, instead make confuse. 10- Why those fatty acids released are important? Please explain. 11- Table 2: please mix both columns (only one zone of clearance column is enough). 12- Tables 3 and 4: why the authors did not tested the same isolates in both culture media? Please explain. This not makes sense for me. 13- Figures 1, 2 and 3: are missing in section Results. Also, the authors should show the Blast results in Table.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer