

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_99614
Title of the Manuscript:	Enhanced L-lysine Production by UV-irradiated and S-2-aminoethyl-L-cysteine resistant mutants derived from Bacillus species using agricultural products as carbon and nitrogen sources
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments <b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> <b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	I read the manuscript interestingly and found some merits. The study is intricately designed and well performed. I have some suggestions only: - The quality of English is poor with spelling mistakes and needs a native speaker. The abstract and conclusion should be precise and more informative.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	No	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

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

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sudhanshu Kr. Bharti
Department, University & Country	Patna University, India