



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	2013_BMRJ_6862
Title of the Manuscript:	Optimization of the production of α -L-rhamnosidase by <i>Aspergillus niger</i> in solid state fermentation using agro-industrial residues
Type of the Article	Research paper

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	The manuscript describes the optimization of the production of α -L-rhamnosidase by <i>Aspergillus niger</i> in SSF using statistical methods. I accept the manuscript for a full paper publication after Minor Changes because it shows some mistakes of description of material and methods and analysis of results.	On behalf of all authors I agree.
Minor REVISION comments	Following some considerations: INTRODUCTION: Line 37 – change [9.10] by [9, 10]. MATERIAL AND METHODS Line 55 – How many grams of solid materials were used? Please, describe it. Line 59 – The correct is $MmSO_4$ or $MnSO_4$? Please, revise this compound. Line 60 – How you adjusted and homogenized the pH on solid medium?	OK Please go to section 2.3.1 substrate selection...and see lines 71 and 72, just before fig.1 , where it contains the requested and more information was also added at the beginning of the paragraph. OK In section 2. Substrate Selection... solid support was moistened with a mineral nutrient solution (adjusted pH 4.5) and further in the pH studies (Section 2.3.2 SSF variable optimization...) a



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 61 – Please, write spores/g of medium instead spores/mL. Line 98 – Were added only 5 mL of sodium acetate buffer into solid medium to extract the enzyme? How was the agitation (under orbital stirring or with magnetic stirring)? Why you did not made it at 4 °C? This temperature prevents the enzymatic degradation while stirring. Line 108 – It was made a standard curve to invertase activity measurement? Please, describe it. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION Figure 2 – Please, improve the quality of the figure and describe what are squares and circles. Line 153 and 154 – The authors described that presence of rice straw in cultures was essential for increased activity. How the authors explain the run 4? In this run	buffered nutrient solution was used the pH value was set using phthalate-HCl or phthalate-NaOH Please see lines 88 and 89 where buffer was used. OK. Sorry but stirring is the wrong word. Description has been improved. A new paragraph has been introduced. Squares and circles have been identified. We apologize but lines 150 to 152 have been removed as they lead to wrong conclusion. Actually these lines belong to a draft version. The explanations for the obtained values are presented in the following sentences just after
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	was found the higher enzymatic activity without rice straw. Line 178-197 – The data about sugar levels are important on this discussion, in addition of the data about sugar consumption. Please, insert a table, or a column on Table 2, with the data of sugar levels from substrates studied. Line 198-200 – Please, revise this sentence. Figure 4 – The quality of this figure is very bad. Please, improve the quality of it. Line 236 – Change <i>Aspergillus. terreus</i> by <i>Aspergillus terreus</i>. Table 3 – Change 0,8 by 0.8. Figure 5 – Please, change this figure into a table. Table 5 – Change: SS by Sum Square; df by Degree of Freedom; MS by Mean Square; <i>P</i> by <i>p</i>-value.	fig.3. OK. Sorry, the sentence lacks the final dot (.) before starting a new sentence. OK. OK. OK. OK.
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Figure 6 - Please, improve the quality of the figure. Line 289 - You found an equation for the predictive analysis? Please, describe it. REFERENCES Line 311-434 – Several References show mistake, such as [1], [6], [8], [9], [15], [16], [17], [21], [30], [31], [32], [33], [34]. Please, verify italic numbers, lack of space, mistakes in specie names, words underlined, absence of page number e letter v. before volume number.	A new paragraph has been inserted. Please see lines 264 to 267 and line 288 OK.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		