SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Microbiology Research Journal International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_MRJI_57679**
Title of the Manuscript:	**UTILIZATION OF VARIOUS STARCH HYDROLYSATES AND DEFATTED PROTIENS BY Bacillus cereus FOR MICROBIAL SYNTHESIS OF METHIONINE IN SUBMERGED MEDIUM.**
Type of the 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:

(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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	1. The work is interesting in principle however, in my opinion, it showed a weakness, regarding the main hypothesis. The authors performed this study with the object to perform an in vitro evaluation of three different strains of Bacillus cereus for a future application in methionine production. To this purpose from a technological point of view, it would be interesting to know the conversion into sugars of each starch with the same enzyme. 2. Check references in the bibliography, do not include gray literature Line 43 (New World Encyclopedia, 2008). 3. The text shifts in uses of L-Methionine. It is not clear the aim of this amino acid is for food human or animal 4. It is recommended to include the% of saccharification since they used the same amount of enzyme for all starches, a reduction sugar count should also be done. 5. It is recommended to explain the selection of each one of the selected substrates for the growth of Bacillus cereus. 6. Apply the standard deviation in all figures 7. In order to improve the results section, it is recommended to perform the $Y_{X/S}$, $Y_{P/S}$ $Y_{P/X}$ performance calculation.	
Minor REVISION comments	1. Check the title, the word PROTIENS is not correct 2. The summary section does not accurately resolve the conclusion of the investigation. 3. It is recommended to use a uniform terminology, agricultural products and substrates are used indiscriminately. 4. Improve the expression of the paragraph on lines 16-20 5. Agricultural residues are rich in bioactive compounds. These residues can be used as an alternate source for the production of different products by microorganisms. But why use food products in the production of methionine? Introduction 1. More information about Bacillus sp. Why three strains for this study? Materials and methods 1. I recommend describing the design of the experiment with the factors i-raw materials,ii-concentration, and iii-Microorganisms. 2. What is the composition of the raw material? 3. Line 98 "in small cubes" are, it recommended a numerical specific interval size ??? 4. About the inoculum. How is pure strain tested before fermentation? 5. Line 136. Which lambda was used to measure the OD? 6. Line 155-156 "P values <0.05 were considered statistically significant, while P values> 0.05 indicate that there is no significant difference" Not common in many explanations. Results 1. Line 169 "P value = 0.000" uses scientific notation 2. It recommended improve the figures meaning.	

	Discussion 1. line 263, additional information "by many workers". 2. Why are the results different if it is the same concentration in the culture medium? 3. Did you evaluate the sugars present in the culture medium? Discussion 1. Although the same substrate is used in other investigations, how can the secondary metabolites obtained be compared? 2. With what argument you can to compare a solid and liquid fermentation in order to obtain secondary metabolites? Biblioggraphy DOI number is not in the references.	
Optional/General comments	Please Check the orthography of the manuscript Some examples: Line 112 saccharifcation Line 128 a orbital shaker126 improve “One loopful of a 24h old culture”	

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Madalyd Yurani Vera Peña**
Department, University & Country	**Universidad de Antioquia, Colombia**