



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Journal Name:	<u>Biotechnology Journal International</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJI_52472
Title of the Manuscript:	Viability of hydrocarbon-degrading bacterial consortium immobilized on different carriers
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<p>The study area is very interesting where the authors describe the use of organic matrix as carrier for microbial immobilization. Nonetheless, the manuscript must be improved in several aspects as the text structure (grammar and configurations) as improve the results and discussion, poorly presented.</p> <p>1) SECTION INTRODUCTION "Not all materials qualify as carrier or support materials for immobilization. For a material to be suitable for immobilization, the material must be insoluble, cost-effective, readily available..." Rewrite and improve this sentence. "The features of these materials that have encouraged their use are their hydrophilic nature, biodegradability, cost effectiveness and biocompatibility. However, natural organic carrier materials may not be suitable for certain applications." Could you please, give some example?</p> <p>2) SECTION MATERIALS AND METHODS 2.1 Isolation of Hydrocarbon-Degrading Bacteria How many soil samples was used? For what purpose the authors heated soil samples at 40C? 2.2 Screening of Carriers Please, how this screening was performed? Please, clarify it and mention the reference. 2.2.2 Immobilization (by adsorption) of bacterial consortium on the carriers 2.3 Enumeration of Total Culturable Heterotrophic Bacteria Hydrocarbon-Utilizing Bacteria These subsections are confusing. What consortium is this? The experiment described in 2.3 used the carriers? Do the authors consider to identify the strains?</p> <p>3) SECTION RESULTS In general, in this section improve the text structure well as the figures and their legend</p> <p>Hydrocarbon-utilizing bacteria- biodegradability test using turbidometric technique – Please, improve and quote the reference.</p> <p>Chemical composition of the carrier materials- Is there any influence in the chemical composition of materials as an efficient carrier? As depicted in the graphics, what do authors mean with 103,6% survival? How do the authors can explain corn cob, soya bran and saw dust as best carriers? Please, improve the results and the discussion.</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General 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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Bruna Martins Dellagneze
Department, University & Country	University of Campinas, Brazil