



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Microbiology
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	In abstract: Last 2 lines: Findings from this study affirmed that decayed <i>Tectona grandis</i> has the ability to generate current and voltage using microbial fuel cell. 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.	
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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	P. Saravana kumari
Department, University & Country	Rathnavel Subramaniam College of Arts and Science ,India