

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Microbiology Research Journal International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_MRJI_102097</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>The Bio-utilization of Used and Unused car Lubricants by Autochthonous Microorganisms</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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.journalmri.com/index.php/MRJI/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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>This manuscript is about bio-utilization of used and unused car lubricants by autochthonous microorganisms. The contents as research article are very limited and I could not see the data for molecular identification analysis which is also important method for the identification. Therefore, I suggest the authors to reorganize the manuscript as a research note. Minor things are commented as mentioned in the article.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The manuscript contributes to the scientific community's understanding of the microbial ecology associated with car lubricants and their implications for bioremediation strategies and environmental management.</li> <li>2. The title accurately reflects the content of the study, which focuses on the utilization of car lubricants by indigenous microorganisms.</li> <li>3. The abstract highlights the analysis of used and unused car lubricants for bio-utilization and the identification of various microorganisms that can use oil lubricants as a source of carbon and energy. The abstract also suggests the potential use of these organisms in environmental biodegradation of hydrocarbons and bioremediation of polluted sites. Additionally, the abstract notes the medical importance of the identified organisms and recommends caution when working with them. Overall, the abstract effectively summarizes the scope and findings of the study.</li> <li>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript seem appropriate.</li> <li>5. The results section only includes a summary of the obtained data without any analysis or interpretation. Providing more information on the significance of the findings and their implications would improve the scientific rigor of the manuscript.</li> <li>6. Many of the references are recent and relevant to the topic of bioremediation and microbial degradation of petroleum hydrocarbons. It is important to rearrange the references in the order in which they appear in the manuscript.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article appear to be suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The species name firstly mentioned in the main text (without abstract) should be written in full name.                      - spp. <b>not</b> spp                      - <i>Nocardia</i> <b>not</b> Norcardia                      - <i>Actinomyces</i> <b>not</b> Actinomuces                      All other things are commented as mentioned in the article.</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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Latifa Hamoudi
Department, University & Country	University of Algiers, Algeria