



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	2013_BMRJ_6873
Title of the Manuscript:	Isolation, Identification and Optimization of Cultural Conditions of Bacillus sp. for Alkalo-thermostable Amylase Production
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	1. Authors are advised to revise the whole manuscript in its usage of grammar and terms. 2. Usage of some units should be standardized, such as "UmL⁻¹" should be "U·mL⁻¹" or "U/ml". 3. In part of "MATERIAL AND METHODS", it is better to combine "2.8 Temperature Profile and stability of amylase" and "2.9 pH Profile and stability of amylase" with "2.5 Effect of different physiological parameters on amylase production". 4. line 115: in "amylase production from this <i>Bacillus</i> sp", does this strain have experimental name or number your team labeled on? If yes, it is better to give the strain label. "Bacillus sp" can't be used as a strain name, and check out the strain name throughout the text. 5. Statistics analysis should be done on all figures. 6. don't put legends in figure title (in figure 1, 2, 7), they should be given at right or bottom of graphs. 7. line 145: can "Effect of carbon source on higher amylase yield" be changed to "Effect of carbon source on amylase yield"? 8. In part of "RESULTS AND DISCUSSION", "3.7 Effect of temperature on amylase activity and thermostability of enzyme" should be combined	1. Revision of manuscript has been made in required area. 2. Standardized units "U/ml" has been used in the manuscript. 3. In part of "Material and Methods", "2.8 Temperature Profile and stability of amylase" and "2.9 pH Profile and stability of amylase" has been combined with "2.5 Effect of different physiological parameters on amylase production"- as subheading 2.5.1 & 2.5.2 in line : '81-82' and '87-88' under heading 2.5 in line : '76-77'. 4. Strain label has been used through out in the manuscript as : <i>Bacillus</i> sp. strain PM1 5. Statistical analysis has been done on all the figures. 6. Legends has been put at the bottom in all the figures. 7. In line 177 : "Effect of carbon source on higher amylase yield" has been changed to "Effect of carbon source on amylase yield". 8. In part of "Results and Discussion", "3.7 Effect of temperature on amylase



SDI Review Form 1.6

	with “3.2 Effect of incubation temperature on amylase production”, and “3.8 Effect of pH on amylase activity and stability of enzyme” should be combined with “3.3 Influence of initial pH of the medium on amylase production”. 9. I don’t think figure 7 is necessary. Authors can describe the details of figure 7 in the text very well.	activity and thermostability of enzyme” has been combined with “3.2 Effect of incubation temperature on amylase production”, in line: 120-121. and “3.8 Effect of pH on amylase activity and stability of enzyme” should be combined with “3.3 Influence of initial pH of the medium on amylase production” as in line: 155-156. Therefore new Figure 1 and 2 has been made due to merging of the data. 9. Figure 7 has been deleted.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		