

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Biotechnology Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJI_99418
Title of the Manuscript:	Optimization of growth parameters for enhancing the production of biosurfactants from <i>Pediococcus pentosaceus</i> S-2
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.journalbjournal.com/index.php/BJI/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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>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)</p>	<p>The manuscript reconfirms the already existing knowledge about bio-surfactant production by LAB. It is an important study from the point of view of commercialization of this product.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>The abstract is well summarized and gives an exact idea about the scope and span of work done; along with the highlights of the results.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes, the references are relevant, adequate and recent.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Some observations regarding data presented in the Results and Discussion:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> E24 % has not been reported in case of effect of various C and N sources on Bio-surfactant production; while for all other parameters, it is mentioned. For easier comparison, uniformity with regards to results would be beneficial. In case of effect of C source, Xylose has been reported as the best source; however the graphical representation indicates Sucrose being the best. Some clarity on this would be appreciated. The control in bar chart for all parameters is showing a significant bio-surfactant production.. hence, % increase in bio-surfactant production would highlight the exact effect of that parameter. In final conclusion, the comparison of the already reported values of bio-surfactant and in the present study, would be value addition to the findings. 	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Aparna Dubhashi
Department, University & Country	G N Khalsa College, Mumbai University, India