



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Microbiology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_44635
Title of the Manuscript:	ELECTRICITY PRODUCTION POTENTIAL OF DECAYED Tectona grandis USING MICROBIAL FUEL CELL
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<u>In abstract: Last 2 lines:</u> Findings from this study affirmed that decayed <i>Tectona grandis</i> has the ability to generate current and voltage using microbial fuel cell. <b>How wood carried out oxidation reduction and produce current? Justify. In molecular studies confirmed that so called <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i> as <i>Micrococcus luteus</i>. Then why it is named thereafter also as <i>staph aureus</i>? Justify is current generation is by microbes or wood. According to that change the title of the study.</b>	All corrections have been effected and highlighted yellow. Thank you
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> 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>	