



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BMRJ_18922
Title of the Manuscript:	Rare codons optimizer host strain of E. coli improves expression of Clostridium septicum alpha toxin gene
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	According to the General Guideline for Authors: 1. All references should follow the following style: Hilly M, Adams ML, Nelson SC. A study of digit fusion in the mouse embryo. Clin Exp Allergy. 2002;32(4):489-98.1. 2. In the text, citations should be indicated by the reference number in brackets [1]. 3. Authors should write conclusions in the manuscript text, as 5. Conclusions	1- All references were corrected base on the recommendation. 2- All the references were numbered in brackets. 3- Conclusions subtitle was added
Minor REVISION comments	line 14 is: "...rosetta by.", should be: "...rosetta." line 17 is: "...of 0.5, 1 and 1.5...", should be: "...of 0.5, 1.0 and 1.5..." line 18 is: "...3-6h..", should be: "...3-6 h.." line 33 is: "...blackquarter..", should be: "...black quarter.." line 41 is: "...an infection(6)", should be: "...an infection [6]." line 42 is: "Alpha toxin (AT), is a cytolytic..", should be: "Alpha toxin is a cytolytic..- Authors can delete this abbreviation, because it is not used in the manuscript" line 46 is: "...398. (8).", should be: "...398 [8]." line 64 is: "...Razi institute.", should be: "...Razi Institute." line 70 is: "...E. coli/Top10 Competent cell...", should be: "...E. coli/Top10 competent cell.." line 82 is: "...for 18 h. different..", should be: "...for 18 h. Different.." line 83 is: "... (0.5, 1 and 1.5mM)..", should be: "... (0.5, 1.0 and 1.5 mM).." line 97 is: "...by the Same..", should be: "...by the same.." line 101 is: "... (figure 1)..", should be: "... (Fig. 1)..- apply a similar change in lines 102, 104, 105, and 108. line 104 is: "...4h after induction by 0.5 mM IPTG..", should be: "...4 h after induction with 0.5 mM IPTG.." line 107 is: "...using Sheep..", should be: "...using sheep.." line 113 is: "...Clostridial..", should be: "...clostridial.." lines 120 is: "...activation also..", should be: "The activation also.." line 121 is: "...in vitro..", should be: "...in vitro.." line 132 is: "...Chloramphenicol..", should be: "...chloramphenicol.." line 137 is: "...30 minutes..", should be: "...30 min.."	All of the reviewer comments in the mentioned lines were corrected and marked as yellow highlight in the manuscript.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	line 138 is: “..revealed that and different..”, should be: “..revealed that different..” line 143 is: “..Clostridial..”, should be: “..clostridial..” line 152 is: “Fig. 2. agarose..”, should be: “Fig. 2. Agarose..” lines 158, 162, 166 is: “..4h..”, should be: “..4 h..” line 161 is: “..Effects of IPTG concentration..”, should be: “..Effect of IPTG concentrations..” line 163 is: “..with 0.5, 1 and 1.5 mM..”, should be: “..with 0.5, 1.0 and 1.5 mM..” line 167 is: “..0.5mM..”, should be: “..0.5 mM..” line 171 is: “7. References”, should be: “References”	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The title of the manuscript describes its content.	