



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Microbiology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_47626
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of strain, pH and ethanol concentration on ethanol activation method of Bacillus spores using a single spore approach
Type of the Article	Original research papers

**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	The conclusions should not be a summary of the results. It is necessary to be concrete and not repeat results. Correctly write citations in references. Discuss all the results obtained in the study, the section should be enriched.	Thanks for the suggestion, the conclusion has been reorganized  Yes the citations were revised Thanks, we when trough the discussion and could not find where to enrich it. We are open to a more precise point to clarify
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Line 99 write the reference correctly. Line 131 correct space before finishing the statement. Add photos of the results.  Line 180 Italize the scientific names.  I suggest adding the standard deviations in the results table.  Line 251, do not add space before the point.  Review the complete manuscript for the spaces in the text, for example line 286.	Line 99:Thanks, this was done Line 131: this was done. Regarding photo of the results, Petri dishes are only used when performing the counting of the spore outgrowth. This is not very useful since the main results are from mathematical elaboration of outgrowth colonies counting. A couple of plates with outgrowth of the two species are represented at the en of these comments.  Line 180. this was done and also verified throughout the text  Regarding the standard deviation, the kinetics are obtained from many Petri dishes. In fact, all the experiments were conducted in triplicate and data merged together to have a more reliable and consistent counts per reading time. So the parameters obtained have standard errors of determination. In order not to overload the table, a statement was added under the tables saying that standard error of estimation lower than 10% in general  Line 251: This was done The complete manuscript was reviewed.
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Scientific names are abbreviated genres after the first time they are mentioned.	Thanks , this was corrected throughout the manuscript

**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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	