

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"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I believe that this manuscript is important for the scientific community. The authors outline the problems associated with traditional fossil fuels-based plastics and make the case for the further research and development of bioplastics. 2. The title of this article is suitable but should be consistent with the use of capitalization in a title. For example, the word "Screening" is capitalized but "indigenous" is not. There is also some inconsistency in the use of capitalization in the section headings. 3. The abstract is comprehensive and adequately summarizes the study. In the first sentence, "effort" should be plural rather than singular. There are some other instances in the manuscript where there are incorrect usages of singular and plural (e.g. "builds" in the second sentence of page 2). I would also add "bioplastics" or an equivalent term to the keywords. 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are generally appropriate but I do think the Discussion section needs some reorganization and additional information. Much of what is in the Discussion section now seems more appropriate to either the Introduction or Methods. I would move some of this information to these sections and add some more discussion of the results. For example, of all the isolates studied only six were selected as suitable candidates. Is there anything similar about the sampling locations, soil type for these samples? Also, I would be interested in some discussion of the limitation and the scope of the methods. For example, since Sudan Black B visualizes the lipid component of the granule is there any way to differentiate the granule contents with this stain? 5. I think the manuscript is scientifically correct. The method selection from the initial screening to the PCR analysis of the phaC gene worked well to identify PHA producing strains. A more definitive identification of the positive isolates may have been done by using molecular methods rather than the conventional bacteriological methods used in this study. However, the work that was done appears to be scientifically sound and should not be considered a barrier to publication. 6. The references are sufficient and recent. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The English language usage is suitable except for the minor items listed in the previous section. Please review the document for additional grammatical errors. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Its not clear how the screening for antibiotic resistance is related to the goal of this study. If there is a clear link between antibiotic resistance and the suitability for industrial applications, please state this in the manuscript. If not, the authors may want to omit these data.</p> <p>Please clarify if the "submerged fermentation" mentioned in section 2.4 and the "Shake flask studies" in section 2.7 are the same method. If so, I would use the same term in both locations.</p> <p>There is no section 2.4.1 and 2.4.2 in section 2.4.</p> <p>I think the reference to figure 2 on page six is a reference to figure 3.</p> <p>On page 9. The continuation of Table two should have a table caption.</p>	

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Richard Ciotola
Department, University & Country	USA