

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_88550
Title of the Manuscript:	Biodegradation of polypropylene (PP) and low density polyethylene (LDPE) by Pseudomonas aeruginosa and Staphylococcus aureus in aquatic microcosms of different pH ranges under mesophilic condition: A comparative approach of some biotic and environmental parameters
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.journaljamb.com/index.php/JAMB/editorial-policy>)

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	A. The abstract is brief and well written. B. The introduction is not brief and requires MIGOR improvements. C. The methodology is not brief aand requires MIGOR improvements. D. Results are not brief and require MIGOR improvements. E. Discussion is not brief and requires MIGOR improvements. F. The conclusion is not brief and required significant improvements. G. the references required significant improvements	Section	Sub-section	Paragraph	Revisions made	Author's comments
		Title			The new title is as follow: Comparison of the biodegradation of polypropylene (PP) and low density polyethylene (LDPE) by <i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i> and <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i> at different pH ranges under mesophilic condition	One of the reviewers asked us to reduce the title length. Its length was 34 words in the old version. It is now 25 words in this revised version
		Abstract	Abstract		The length of this section has decreased. The key words number has also decreased	We were asked to reduce the length of Abstract-section. Its length has decreased from 350 words in the old version of the manuscript to 289 words in this revised version. In the " Author's Guide ", a maximum length of 300 words is recommended.
				Paragraph 1	The length has been shortened in this revised	We were asked to reduce the length of the introduction-

Review Form 1.6

		1. Introduction	1. Introduction		version	section. The total length of this Introduction-section has decreased from 1164 words in the old version to 658 words in this revised version.
				Paragraph 2	The length has been shortened in this revised version	
				Paragraph 3	This paragraph which was in the old version of the manuscript has been completely removed in this revised version	
		2. Materials and Methods	2.2. Isolation and identification of bacterial strains	Paragraph 5	For this paragraph which was in the old version, a part has been deleted and another part has been sent to the discussion section in this revised version. It is now the last paragraph of the discussion section	This is according to
					Paragraph 1	
					Paragraph 1	
		2. Materials and Methods	2.5. Biodegradability assessment of the LDPE		Paragraph 1	This paragraph of 105 words which was in the old version of the manuscript has

Review Form 1.6

			and PP fragments		been completely removed in this revised version	been completely removed in this revised version. This was requested by the reviewers
		3. Results	3.1. Temporal variation of the pH values of solutions during incubation	Paragraphs 1 and 2	Some sentences have been shortened and others have been removed	
			3.2. Temporal variation of the electrical conductivity values of solutions during incubation	Paragraphs 1 and 2	Some sentences have been shortened and others have been removed	
			3.3. Temporal variation of the weights of polymers in solutions during incubation	Paragraphs 1 and 2	Some sentences have been shortened and others have been removed	
			3.4. Temporal variation of the cells abundance in solutions during incubation	Paragraphs 1 and 2	Some sentences have been shortened and others have been removed	
				Paragraph 1	Some sentences have	The total length of this discussion-

Review Form 1.6

		4. Discussion	Discussion		been shortened	section has decreased from 1337 words in the old version to 1191 words in this revised version
				Paragraph 4	This paragraph which was in the old version of the manuscript has been completely removed in this revised version	
				Paragraph 5	Two sentences have been deleted	
				Paragraph 9	This paragraph which was in the old version of the manuscript has been completely removed in this revised version	
		5. Conclusion		Paragraph 10	This paragraph does not exist in the old version. This is the second part of paragraph 5 of the introduction in the old version, which has been brought here in this revised version.	This paragraph does not exist in the old version. This is the second part of paragraph 5 of the introduction in the old version, which has been brought here in this revised version. This resulted from our own point of view.
					The conclusion has been revised and its length has been reduced	

Review Form 1.6

		6. References			Many old references have been removed.	<p>The numbering of references in the whole revised version of manuscript has been changed according to the revisions we carried out.</p> <p>The total number of references cited has decreased from 65 in the old version of the manuscript to 41 in this revised version.</p> <p>This was also one of the consequences of reducing the length of the introduction-section, methodology-section, and discussion-section as requested by the reviewers.</p> <p>In addition, we have been asked to remove old references that are not absolutely essential.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	References cited must be current (last 5 years if possible)					
Optional/General comments	This manuscript is acceptable, but must be corrected first according to the instructions above.					

Review Form 1.6

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	