



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Microbiology Research Journal International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_57679
Title of the Manuscript:	UTILIZATION OF VARIOUS STARCH HYDROLYSATES AND DEFATTED PROTIENS BY <i>Bacillus cereus</i> FOR MICROBIAL SYNTHESIS OF METHIONINE IN SUBMERGED MEDIUM.
Type of the Article	Research paper

**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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/editorial-policy> )



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

**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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. First of all, I would like to congratulate the authors on the chosen research topic. Indeed, it is a very interesting paper, especially when considering the limitations of producing methionine by fermentation processes.</li> <li>2. I suggest that the introduction must be revised regarding the correct use of the English language. Also, I think that the authors should emphasize the importance of methionine for different purposes (maybe, by giving economic information).</li> <li>3. In the abstract it is informed that the identification of the bacteria was done by 16S rRNA sequencing. However, there is no information about the sequencing in the material and methods section. I advise you to insert this information in the first topic of the materials and methods section to make it clearer.</li> <li>4. The results described for Figure 1 are not correct. For example, it was stated that yam and cowpea gave a methionine yield of 1.78mg/ml by <i>Bacillus cereus</i> DS13, while potato and cowpea gave worse yield (1.08mg/ml). However, when we look into the graphic, we see that this information actually belongs to <i>Bacillus cereus</i> AS9. Maybe you have written it wrong in the text or made a mistake when putting the data in the graphic. Please, check it out and correct it.</li> <li>5. The results described for Figure 2 also present the same problem as mentioned above. Please, check it out and correct it.</li> <li>6. The results described for Figure 3 also present the same problem as mentioned above. Please, check it out and correct it.</li> <li>7. The results described for Figure 4 also present the same problem as mentioned above. Please, check it out and correct it.</li> <li>8. The problem found in the Results section is also observed in the discussion. For example, the authors state 1 that "wheat stimulated a high yield of 1.85mg/ml by <i>Bacillus cereus</i> RS16". However, when we look into Figure 1 the actual value for RS16 is 1,46. Please, check all the results and discussion section since all the other results are also incoherent. Moreover, check the figures to make sure if the results are presented correctly. Then, rewrite these two sections with the requested corrections.</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Replace "protiens" for "proteins" in the title.</li> <li>2. At the end of the introduction, on the bottom line, it would be interesting to replace "<i>Bacillus</i> species" by "different strains of <i>Bacillus cereus</i>" since you only studied the referred species.</li> <li>3. In the second section of results, correct the misspelling "evaulated".</li> <li>4. Please, check the whole text regarding the correct use of the English language.</li> </ol>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Larissa Alves</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Federal University of Ceará, Brazil</b>