



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	2013_BMRJ_7217
Title of the Manuscript:	Molecular Identification of Bacillus species in Commercial Honey
Type of the Article	Review 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	Aim in abstract should be more specific as aim of study... not introduction of work? Please revise. Scope and importance of the work should be emphasised on contaminated honey as test samples not for the techniques as these techniques are considered now a days as basic techniques.? Clearly mention why primers XB used in these studies not general 16sRNA identification procedures in relation to philia? Marker was used consist of un matched size 100bp to compare 500 to 600 bp? Line 107 Conclusion of MS is way too weak and probably mistaken support of growth is different kind of study detection of growth is what was done . spores from bacillus species can also be present in honey samples with no growth No comments on Gram negative results One table could be included to compare different techniques identification ..	



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	An Overall improvement of English used is required some of corrections noticed are to be considered 24: Biochemical tests 65: newer to modern techniques 121: amplifications? Spaces and full stops editing errors should be revised One figure could be more than sufficien	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer