



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	1. I think this is a research article. It is full of mistakes. 2. Remove Study Design and Place and Duration of Study section from abstract. 3. This manuscript is also full of typo errors and spelling mistakes, like in abstract line 22, <i>bacillus</i>. It would be <i>Bacillus</i> 4. Add a section in introduction describing the antibacterial property of honey. You can use the following paper as reference there : Antibacterial efficacy of raw and commercially available honey S Rahman, F Salehin, A Iqbal African Journal of Biotechnology 10 (54), 11269-11272 5. In result authors said about Morphological studies. But nothing was found in method material section about this matter. 6. In fig 2 legend what is the meaning of A? 7. In fig 2 legend what is the meaning of B? 8. Please rewrite the whole manuscript with a	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	help of more experience researcher.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		