



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_47302
Title of the Manuscript:	The biosorption features of Cr (VI) ions by dried biomass of a facultative anaerobic Bacillus cereus strain Pf-1
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The subject of the article is interesting and has high scientific value, but there are some aspects, that could be improved. All abbreviations, when used for the first time, should be explained. Overall, the manuscript demands English editing by a native speaker, because some sentences are unclear.	Thank you for your comments. Corrections done.
Minor REVISION comments	Line 44: Why 'Bioreduction' is written in the capital letter? Line 64: The objective of the present study – should be written as 'was', not 'is'. Line 76: There is 'Pure culture previously isolated in...' Should be 'Pure culture previously isolated from...' In this sentence I do not understand the '(under review)' – what is under review? Line 94: Why 'Hydrochloric' is written in the capital letter? Lines 96-97: rephrase the sentence so as to use the expression 'initial concentration' only once. Line 106: 'adsorb' or 'adsorbed'? In Results and discussion subtitles a, b and c – should be more informative (FTIR analysis of what?; effects of biosorption conditions on what?) Lines 154-156: rephrase the sentence, it is unintelligible. There is no verb in the second part of the sentence (passive voice). Line 160: there is 'changed' and should it be 'changes'? 'These changed' – to what is related to? The previous sentence? Rephrase the sentence. Line 166: 'sp' – write in normal font, not italic. Results should be written in the past simple, while they are discussed once in the present simple, once in the past simple tense. Fig. 2: what mean the error bars? Give statistics to the manuscript. Line 233: there should be 'used' not 'use'. Figs. 3 and 4: remove frames from the legends. Fig. 3: which is A and which is B (as indicated in the caption) – complete it. Figs. 3-4: Y axis legend should be shortly explained in the captions. ' <i>Bacillus cereus</i> ' can be used as ' <i>B. cereus</i> ' in lines 309; 385-386, 393, 397. Table 5: 'M16' and 'Pf-1' strain name – use normal font, not italic. Line 395: '... biosorption capacity...' of what? Lines 403-405: the sentence should be rephrased – the English style is incorrect. Authors should emphasise – the dried biomass of what? Line 405: the symbol of strain 'Pf-1' for <i>B. cereus</i> should be given – as the presented research concerns that strain. References: within 32 cited, the newest is from 2013. From before 6 years. Fortify the manuscript with more recent data (2015-2018). At the end of the manuscript, there is one more figure (pH/sorption capacity). Is that supplementary material? I cannot find the connection with the text. Where is the caption and citation?	



SDI Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments		
----------------------------------	--	--

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>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>