



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	2015_IJBcRR_16236
Title of the Manuscript:	Presence of multiple aspartic proteinases in porcine ovary
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	None	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	None	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	-Why the absorbance was measured only at 280nm? When studying proteins, it is recommended to also use 216nm wavelengths, to detect peptide bonds. I don't know if there are Aspartic proteases without aromatic groups in their aminoacid residues, but if they exist, they shouldn't be detected at 280nm.	In fact we have used absorbance at 280 nm to detect the acid soluble proteolytic products of denatured bovine haemoglobin and to get an idea about total protein concentration. We were not aiming to measure the aspartic proteinase concentration. According to the findings of the study (not all are shown in the manuscript) the aspartic proteinases detected were only minor proteins. However intermittently we have got measurements at 215 nm and the absorbances were very high and the variation between fractions was not clear enough.