

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_96125
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF VARIOUS CARBON AND NITROGEN SOURCES ON DECOLORIZATION OF TEXTILE DYES BY PSEUDOMONAS TAIWANENSIS STRAIN TNZ3
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>)

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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. Yes 2. Yes. Note : Species not written in all capital letters 3. No, Not all data results are included 4. Yes 5. Yes 7. Not yet, all have not used the recent reference The method lacks detail, the data should be analyzed and discussed its significance or at least use a standard deviation, the discussion has not covered all the data. All the things that are my notes are in the manuscript	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, suitable for scholarly communications. But, there are several vocabulary used that must be revised. Ex: "test"	
Optional/General comments	Major revision (The method lacks detail, the data should be analyzed and discussed its significance or at least use a standard deviation, the discussion has not covered all the data. All the things that are my notes are in the manuscript)	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ratna Stia Dewi
Department, University & Country	Jenderal Soedirman University, Indonesia