



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, corrects the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The word "biomass" at line 46 should read: "substrate". 2) The phrase of line 38/39 is not understood. The authors should revisit it. 3) I totally disagree with the authors on the use of the OVAT (One-Variable-at-Time) method for optimization in an era which much more precise and challenging statistical tools are available for this. 4) "Time" and not "duration" at line 117. Time is a parameter with accepted unit as: seconds, hour, day....). 5) Temps (h) at the top of figures 3 & 4 is not English. That's French! 6) All the titles of the Figures do not describe what is going on as process. When the authors write at the X-axis "Reducing sugars released during the saccharification of wheat flour"; they give the impression as if there are identified sugar substances being plotted". "Amounts of reducing sugars released with time of saccharification of wheat flour should be the right title". Similarly, the titles: "Monitoring of ethanol production and reducing sugars....." of Figures 3 & 4 make no sense. What the authors are reporting should be "Amounts of ethanol produced and reducing sugars fermented with time during....." 7) The paper does not in any way give information as to : "an amylase hyper-producer strain <i>Bacillus subtilis</i> TLO3 newly isolated from natural soil" as mentioned by authors in line 10 in the section "abstract" It rather 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	compares amounts of reducing sugars produced or amounts of ethanol produced from wheat and corn flours. No comparison with other strains to show that <i>Bacillus subtilis</i> TLO3 is truly a hyper-producer of α -amylase.	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Line 48. What is actually fermented is an <i>aqueous extract of sugars</i> and not just sugars 2) The sub-heading at line 115: “Reducing sugars fermentation and ethanol production” should read thus: Fermentation of reducing sugars and ethanol production. 	
Optional/General comments	At the end of Introduction, the authors affirm that comparison of the substrates used and alcohol production from the said substrates were compared. This can lead readers to think this was the objective of the work; whereas it's very clear the authors' objective here is reporting strain <i>B. subtilis</i> TLO3 as potentially a powerful producer of high amounts of α -amylase for hydrolysing starch for the production of ethanol during yeast fermentation. I will propose they rewrite the sentence at lines 49 and 50.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	NSO Emmanuel
Department, University & Country	Process engineering, University of Ngaoundere, Cameroon