

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_89657
Title of the Manuscript:	Isolation and screening of biosurfactant producing lactic acid bacteria from traditional Indian cereal-based fermented food "Seera."
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.journalcjast.com/index.php/CJAST/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	<p>It would be better if the title of the article was edited by giving "Pediococcus pentosaceus". I suggest re-examining the introduction.</p> <p>2 and 3, which are not directly related to the subject. I suggest removing paragraphs. Was the starchy part that precipitated in the sample preparation part taken? Was the water sterile? How is surface tension calculated? It would be better if this is given in the text. The following section should be removed</p> <p>According to different studies, <i>Pediococcus pentosaceus</i> can be found in idli, fermented vegetables, sausages, fermented pickles, cheese, etc. It has also been isolated from different food sources such as [53,54].</p> <p>For what purpose was the growth curve drawn? This is not required in this study. Figure 1 is not needed. Pictures are unclear in morphological identification. Images should either be given clearly or completely removed from the article.</p> <p>Table5, 6 and table7 should be combined</p> <p>LAB development time is usually 48 hours. Timed production is required to determine that the 48th hour is the best time for biosurfactant production. It would be more correct to remove this phase of the study.</p> <p>It would be nice if the discussion could be expanded. References should be carefully reviewed. It would be good if you pay attention to the abbreviations. Missing and incorrect spellings should be corrected. Must be rewritten according to the spelling rules</p> <p>The following resources should be completed. Sample; Rodrigues L, Moldes A, Teixeira J, Oliveira R. Kinetic study of fermentative biosurfactant production by <i>Lactobacillus</i> strains.2006: Microbiological and biochemical characterization of seera: A starch-based bioenriched fermented food of Himachal Pradesh.2012: 2(1):49-56</p> <p>The article should be carefully reviewed</p> <p>Spelling rules must be followed.</p> <p>Figures are incomprehensible.</p> <p>If it is not necessary, it is useful to remove it.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

[Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Merih Kıvanç
Department, University & Country	Turkey