

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Biotechnology Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJI_83796
Title of the Manuscript:	Molecular identification of Bacillus species during spontaneous fermentation of Lima bean flour (<i>Phaseolus lunatus</i>)
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:

(<https://www.journalbjournal.com/index.php/BJI/editorial-policy>)

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>Introduction: The introduction is well written. It captures the main objective of the research in the last paragraph of the introduction.</p> <p>Materials and Methods: The bean image (Fig.1) provided is very bad. It needs to be replaced. A clear picture with distinct features will be appropriate. Reconcile the 100 DNA bacteria extraction with A total number of 101 bacterial strains were isolated from fermented <i>Phaseolus lunatus</i> flour. All 101 isolates were rods, Gram-positive and catalase positive.</p> <p>Table 2 should include a column of all the 100/101 bacteria isolates and a column for the corresponding <i>Bacillus</i> species identified.</p> <p>Results and discussion: Good. However, the authors did not indicate the submission of 16s rRNA sequence results in a public database.</p> <p>33 isolates for <i>Bacillus cereus</i> and 64 isolates for other <i>Bacillus</i> species is not equal to 100/101. Reconcile or explain the shortfall.</p>	<p>Comment: Materials and Methods: The bean image (Fig.1) provided is very bad. Response: a new bean image was provided</p> <p>Comment: Reconcile the 100 DNA bacteria extraction with..... Response: Correction was done</p> <p>Comment: Results and discussion: Good. However, the authors did not indicate the submission of 16s rRNA sequence results in a public database. Response: 16s rRNA sequence results were submitted in a public database but results were not provided</p> <p>Comment: 33 isolates for <i>Bacillus cereus</i> and 64 isolates for other <i>Bacillus</i> species is not equal to 100/101 Response: Correction was done.</p>
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	