



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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	General comment This study try to focus in honey isolate identification, the idea is good, but I think the practical work is not enough and the manuscript need complete scientific and grammatical revision. I advise the author to read more in his point. Introduction It is need more focus in honey isolates Materials and methods Line 69-78. The author doesn't say the honey was collected at which stage? Result and discussion I feel confused through the results; first the author (line 114-115) said thatMorphological and biochemical identification showed that out of the forty isolates three were identified as Micrococcus sp. And two were identified asEubacterium sp. The microbial load of the honey samples were observed to be high. In line (121-122) he said that Out of the forty isolates 14 generated	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	amplicons 4,5,6,8,11,12,13,15,17,20,21, 30 35 and 38, these ampl;icons were quite similar. This shows the remaining 27 isolates were not Bacillus species. Is that meaning that the morphological and biochemical identification identified only five isolates???? The author don't mentioned all the morphological and biochemical testes in the results, I think some results was missed. Also, how he decided that the microbial population in honey is high; the isolation was done from 33 honey samples?? Also, I fell confuse through the discussion the author talk about many molecular identification method and he does not focus enough in the method he used, Is the molecular identification in this manuscript revealed difference between these honey Bacillus isolates ande.g Bacillus isolates from soil??? The author said (Thepresence of high microbial population in honey indicates the non-hygienic condition) and lack of safety of the product been used to treat various ailments Why the author don't investigate if the isolates has toxicity or not ?????? I advise the author to read more about honey isolates Esawy1,* , M A.Awad G. E.A., Ahmed E. F.; Danial E. N.and Mansour NM (2012). Evaluation of honey as new reservoir for probiotic bacteria	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	advances in food science 34 :72-81 Esawy, M.A., Ahmed, E.F., Helmy,W.A., Mansour, N.M., El-Senousy,W.M., and El-Safty , M.M. (2011). Production of levansucrase from novel honey <i>Bacillus subtilis</i> isolates capable of producing antiviral levans. Carbohydr.Polym, 36, 823-830 Esawy M.A., Amer H., b, Gamal-EldeenA.M.,ElEnshasy H.A., Helmy W.A., Abo-Zeid M.A.M., Malek R., Abo-Zeid M.A.M., Malek R., Ahmed E.F. (2013). Ghada E.A. Awad. Scaling up, characterization of levan and its inhibitory role in carcinogenesis initiation stage Carbohydrate Polymers, xxx (2013) xxx– xxx Esawy, M. A; Mansour, S. H. ; Ahmed, E. F. Hassanein, N. M. and El Enshasy H. A. (2012) Characterization of Extracellular Dextranase from a Novel Halophilic <i>Bacillus subtilis</i> NRC-B233b a Mutagenic Honey Isolate under Solid State Fermentation,. E. Journal of Chemistry 9: 1494-1510 Patel R.C. (2012). Invertase production from <i>Aspergillus</i> SPP MI isolation from hony comb.Bioresearch Vol. No 4 (1-5).	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer