

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_103169
Title of the Manuscript:	Isolation, antibiofilm activity and characterization of biosurfactant produced by Limosilactobacillus reuteri IDCC 3701
Type of the Article	Research 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:

(<https://www.journalmrji.com/index.php/MRJI/editorial-policy>)

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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	- The current manuscript is important for scientific community as contains important data for the use of microbially produced surfacts as antibiofilm components. The manuscript is scientifically correct. - The use of the word "Isolation" through the manuscript is highly misleading as it is used for microorganism not for products, in our field. - The abstract of the article is comprehensive, but neglected GC analysis of the biosurfact. - The subsections and structure of the manuscript is appropriate. - References are somewhat old and need to be updated. - In general, reference section style should be revised (revise 25) and care should be given to writing and avoid the extensive use of " et al.".	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	- In "Equation 1." add "(%)" beside "EI" and avoid writing "The result is expressed in percentage." - Discussion can be improved.	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mostafa M. Abo Elsoud
Department, University & Country	National Research Centre, Egypt