



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Biotechnology Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJI_35030
Title of the Manuscript:	Production of raw starch degrading amylase by Bacillus subtilis 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduction: this part was not well arranged, and the authors did not express their intended meanings well. And some words should be defined. 2. Methodology: in this section, statistics and test method should be provided to estimate the effectivities of the results. 3. Results section: in this part, fig1 and fig2 were not depicted well, and with fig3 and fig4, the values were depicted wrong. And X-axis of fig 4 should be rearranged. 4. Conclusion section: this section was not written well, and it should be rewritten. 5. Please see other comments in the pdf file. <p>The authors studied the methods to convert starch into alcohol. This technique is useful and maybe has a potential to improve industry scale use. This manuscript is perhaps interesting to readers.</p>	<p>I would like to thank the reviewer for these valuable remarks.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The introduction was rearranged and some ideas were re-expressed more clearly. 2. Standard deviations were added to the figures 3. Corrections were made in all figures. 4. The conclusion was modified 5. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5.1. Line 1: <i>B. subtilis</i> is in italic 5.2. Line 22-23: the expression was re-written. 5.3. Line 29-30: the 1st and 2nd generation technologies are defined in the same paragraph. 5.4. Line 45: <i>ie</i> was removed 5.5. Line 106: results are represented in Table 1. 5.6. Line 120: The values were corrected. 5.7. Line 124-125: the discussion of the point was supported with some other references. 5.8. Conclusion was rewritten.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Please see noted in the pdf file.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This manuscript needs a major revision.	