SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**British Microbiology Research Journal**
Manuscript Number:	**2014_BMRJ_12448**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Production, Purification and Characterization of Levan Polymer from Bacillus lentus V8 Strain**
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	1) The text of the manuscript has to be extensively edited for English language. The authors should use either language correction service or use the help of a native English speaker who knows not only the language, but also the research area. Numerous sentences of the manuscript are illiterate. In the manuscript, I highlighted some text that certainly needs serious attention from the aspect of grammar and orthography. 2) There is also a major problem with data in the manuscript regarding calculations of the amount of levan according to the content of fructose in it. As written in the manuscript, levan was hydrolyzed and the amount of fructose was determined using a commercial kit containing glucose oxidase. But, glucose oxidase does not oxidize fructose, it oxidizes only glucose. So, when using this kit, only content of glucose residues of the levan polymer is determined. Levan indeed contains glucose. Each long chain of levan begins with glucose residue originating from sucrose molecule used as the first fructosyl acceptor. Glucose content of levan is very low, especially when chains are long and fructose is main constituent of levan. This is why the amounts of levan according to dry weight are much higher than the amounts calculated after levan hydrolysis and analysis by glucose oxidase. I insist that the	

	authors take out all the material regarding data on levan content calculated on the basis of 'fructose' content, because they did not measure the amount of fructose. Fructose content of acid-hydrolysed levan can be measured enzymatically using a kit containing hexokinase, fructose-6-phosphate isomerase and glucose-6-phoshate dehydrogenase. Or, it can be done using the HPLC method. For more issues, please see the original text of the manuscript to which my comments and text highlights (designating poor language and grammar) are added.	The correction was done
Minor REVISION comments	Black strap sugar cane molasses should be defined and its composition briefly characterized. Lanes 75-76. Parameters of levan fermentation (yield, effective yield, productivity and yield coefficient relative to biomass) should be defined and their calculation briefly described. Lanes 93 and 427. Presence of nitrogen in levan should be explained.	Black strap sugar cane molasses was defined and characterize the composition This parameters were defined Nitrogen determination in materials & methods and results was deleted which determined in polymer product.
Optional/General comments		