

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_95713
Title of the Manuscript:	Isolation and Screening of indigenous Polyhydroxyalkanoates producing bacterial strain
Type of the Article	Original 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.journaljamb.com/index.php/JAMB/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The manuscript "Isolation and screening of indigenous polyhydroxyalkanoates producing bacterial strain" is of interest of general audience and reports strains with potential biotechnological use. The information given is useful for the field and upon reconsideration, makes this manuscript suitable for acceptance to be published by Journal of Advances in Microbiology. Bibliography is up to date. However, there is limitation of isolates identification at the genus level only. Some questions are described as follows.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Check grammar. The English should be re-examined. Check period, comma, spaces between numbers and symbols</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Standardize "hour". I suggest the use "h". Gram should be spelled with capital letter. Title Attention to the first letter: are they all uppercase or lowercase? Abstract It is necessary to provide the full form before providing the abbreviated form. Inform from which samples the strains were isolated. Keywords: Change some keywords; they are in the title and abstract. Introduction There isn't description about the reason the mentioned environments were selected for use in the study. No information is shown about the reason for antibiotic testing Methodology Add the manufacturers of the culture media used. The second paragraph of topic 2.4 is confusing. Please rewrite. What were the temperature and time used to sterilize basal medium? "Cells were collected from fermentation broth by centrifugation..." RPM; time?? What was the proportion of sodium hypochlorite and chloroform mixture?? What was the ratio of acetone-methanol mixture? What were the concentrations of these solutions? Again, centrifugation: rpm, time. Add brand/manufacturer names (equipment). I do not find any reason to antibiotic susceptibility. Quantitative test: how many times the experiment was repeated? Results What is the difference between poor and weak? And High = excellently?? Be specific. The resolution of figures should be improved (print quality). Figure 2: I suggest a negative control figure. Figure 4: Capital letter 3.3. The results were poorly explored. The figure is unclear.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	3.4. delete "best" 3.5. "The results as shown in figure 3..." Figure 5 Discussion Check some reference citations in the text, mainly citations at the beginning of the sentences. Last paragraph: Unclear relevance. Discuss the relevance of the findings, instead of just comparing them with another findings. References References must be formatted in accordance with journal requirements	
--	--	--

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hugo Calixto Fonseca
Department, University & Country	Institute of Agricultural Sciences, Federal University of Minas Gerais, Brazil