

Reviewer's Comment:

As a proof I join the above mentioned documents, where in the authors' comments I marked yellow completely incomprehensible for me sentences or quasi-sentences. There is also the worse case – the revised paper is badly formatted and words are glued – it is not my duty to re-format text to make it readable (as an example I marked yellow glued words on the first 2 pages). It is important, because authors' English is highly imperfect – in my opinion - does not even meet the low criteria. Even relatively simple data are presented with errors e.g three type of bactria (Esherichia coli ,Prouteus mirabilis ,staphylococcus aureas) where almost every term is badly spelled (bactria instead bacteria, Prouteus instead of Proteus, staphylococcus aureas instead of Staphylococcus aureus etc. The next week point is using the space bar, colon key, point key etc. – just against the typographic rules.

Formally I could write it into the final evaluation form and suggest rejection, but – may be – technical aspect could be improved and – as a next step - proper re-evaluation will be possible.

Let me know, which option is suitable for the IJBcRR.

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	Poland