



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biotechnology and Bioresource Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJB2T_53946
Title of the Manuscript:	Data on draft genome sequence of Bacillus sp. strain AN2 isolated from agricultural soil in Brazil
Type of the Article	Data 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/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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>The manuscript is okay, although it has some minor weaknesses as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The abstract should be purely descriptive and describe the contents of the data article. These author has described the contents beyond the data article requirement. Has given the importance of various genes in the data as simulated by the computer, this should only appear in research article not data article. 2. The author should provide a link to the data to make it easier for the readers to find the data. 3. The author need to include a small section outlining why it was important to share this data with other scientists (This should not be confused with biological importance). 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Conclusion in the abstract should be removed 2. Abbreviations should be defined 3. Read and implement changes as tracked in the manuscript 	
Optional/General comments	It is important for the author to know that the data is not judged on its significance but on its utility and potential reuse. He/she should therefore just describe the data without attaching to its biological significance.	

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:	Clabe Simiyu Wekesa
Department, University & Country	Friedrich Schiller Universität Jena, Germany