



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_50020
Title of the Manuscript:	Isolation and Molecular Characterization of Acid Producing Bacteria from Oilfield Environments Located in the Niger Delta, Nigeria
Type of the 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 <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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>Line 2: Niger Delta is broad, the topic can be reframed to, for instance “from waste water from selected oilfields within Niger Delta, Nigeria”.</p> <p>Line 27: produced water is not a key word following the title but if reframed then it stands.</p> <p>Line 31 – 36: also as above, should be part of introduction if title is reframed knowing that the waste water in question is produced water.</p> <p>Line 55: if all the locations are in one or different states within Niger Delta region, please name the states.</p> <p>Lines 88 and 89: why purify in MacConkey agar? Nutrient agar is ideal for purification. OR whose method did you employ there?</p> <p>For the graphs, there should be a key beside the table or under to interpret the abbreviated terms SA, SB, SC e.t.c.</p> <p>Discussion is relating your findings to other people's findings either in agreement or disagreement and so should not have subheadings as pH, Temperature. Each item is discussed but everything should be allowed to flow. Please work on that.</p> <p>Lines 279 – 311: your references have issues; you have to be consistent with a particular format considering what the journal type is and do not abbreviate journal names.</p> <p>E.g. Mills, H .J., Martine, R. J, Story, S and Sobecky, P.A. (2005). Characterization of microbial community structure in Gulf of Mexico gas hydrates: comparative analysis of DNA-and RNA-derived clone libraries. <i>Applied .Environmental. Microbiology.</i> 71, 3235 – 3247.</p> <p>This is APA style but must be in consonance with what is obtainable in this journal.</p>	All corrections effected as suggested
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>Line 9 -14: conjunction can be used in the following sentences; The multiple tube fermentation technique was used to isolate the bacteria while Phenol red dextrose broth was used as the microbiological medium for the isolation of the acid producing bacteria. Also total heterotrophic bacteria count (THBC) was determined under aerobic and anaerobic condition using the standard plate count techniques and the boiling method used for the extraction of acid producing bacterial DNA after growing in Luria Bertani broth.</p> <p>Again cite the scientist whose method you used for the isolation of the acid producing bacteria and if you are referring to organic acid please include that both in your title.</p>	All corrections effected as suggested



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Line 48, 109, 273 delete space; 49: remove coma from is.</p> <p>Line 74: 7 days</p> <p>Other topographical errors;</p> <p>lines 87; 96 – 99, 119, 126, 216,219, 220, 274 create space between the figure and unit,</p> <p>line 96: spinned not spun,</p> <p>lines 203, 206, 227: degree centigrade or any unit should be attached to each figure</p> <p>Line 234: duration; 235: results of the study,</p> <p>Line 269: APB meaning? Write in full then abbreviation in bracket, don't assume that at a glance a reader will know is acid producing bacteria.</p>	
<u>Optional/General comments</u>		

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>

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>	