



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Biotechnology Journal International
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>)

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In the Introduction section, the authors should accurately present the current state of knowledge on the use of immobilized microorganisms in the bioremediation of areas contaminated with petroleum compounds. - Materials and methods – description of immobilization process is confusing. - Line 84 - Carrier size should be defined. What does 50 g corn cob mean? Was it one piece or a 50 g corn cob cut into some fragments? How many were there, what was their shape? It all affects the efficiency of immobilization. - Lines 102-104 - In what medium was the carrier incubated for 21 days? - Line 104 - How were bacterial cells released from the carrier to determine the efficiency of immobilization? - What bacterial incubation time with the carrier was chosen for further study? - How many days were the bacteria immobilized before the ready carriers with bacteria into the medium with hydrocarbons were introduced? - Equation 1 is missing. - Lines 123-125 – In this subsection is lack of results. In this part of the paper, the authors should present what these bacteria were, as well as present the growth curves of free bacterial cells in the presence of hydrocarbons. - In the discussion section, the authors presented the results of other authors, but very little attention was devoted to their own results. They should make suggestions as to why some carriers were better than others. In Discussion section, authors should relate their results to results from other papers. The discussion is not a literature review. 	
Minor REVISION comments	-	
Optional/General comments	-	



[SDI 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:	Urszula Guzik
Department, University & Country	University of Silesia in Katowice, Poland