



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Biotechnology Journal International</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJI_35030
Title of the Manuscript:	Production of raw starch degrading amylase by <i>Bacillus subtilis</i> TLO3 and its application in bioethanol production using starch-rich flours
Type of the 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	<p>1.- The title of the document indicates that an important part of the paper is related to amylase production, nevertheless the information about this topic it is not mentioned at the introduction.</p> <p>2.- A better description of the methodology is required i.e. (information about the form of the substrate used and how it was obtained, the size of the flask used for the amylase production, the system employed. The term "optimization" is not correctly use. The statistical analysis is not mentioned. The conditions of sampling is not mentioned during fermentation.</p> <p>3.- In results and discussion section it is mentioned that production yields were determined, this information it is not presented in the methodology section. The authors indicated "the optimized conditions" and expressed that these results are promising to large scale production, nevertheless with the information presenting in the document it is not possible to make this affirmation. The section indicates results and discussion but no discussion is presented. The author also indicates 5 parameters related to the bioethanol production from this substrate, nevertheless in the document there is not information related to them.</p> <p>4.- None figure or table is presented about "optimization" process. Four points for a fermentation process in a graphic are not enough to conclude any result, besides the steady state was not reached, there are not error bars in the</p>	<p>I would like to thank the reviewer for these valuable remarks.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The work is focusing on the application of crude amylase on ethanol production; which is the main subject; because the subject of amylase production has been widely studied and discussed, In the introduction we mentioned the amylase production as follow: "The raw starch contained in the flours was pre-treated with crude amylase produced by the strain <i>B. subtilis</i> TLO3, which optimal production conditions were previously investigated." 2. The substrates used are flours purchased from commercial sources and weren't analysed. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sampling conditions were added. • Standard deviations are given in Table 1 and in graphs 1 and 2. 3. Results related to amylase production optimization were added and presented in the table 1. About the parameters influencing the ethanol production, it is not a part of the present work but only a discussion. Authors are planning to do



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>graphics. For ethanol production there was not information between 6 to 24 hrs, error bars are also missing.</p>	<p>an optimization of ethanol production and all parameters will be studied.</p> <p>4. Optimization results are gathered in table 1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Error bars were added. • Concerning the fermentation time, most studies on ethanol production take samples only after 4h because the yeast enters in its log phase at this time.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		