



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	2014_BMRJ_15435
Title of the Manuscript:	Proteases Production by a Novel Bacterial Isolate <i>Bacillus amyloliquefaciens</i> 35s Obtained from Soil of The Nile Delta of Egypt
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	1. To provide more information to support the title "... a Novel Bacterial Isolate <i>Bacillus amyloliquefaciens</i> 35s...", the authors should characterize qualitatively the proteinases produced by the new isolate. The questions such as the number and the type of proteinases being produced should be addressed. 2. <i>Bacillus amyloliquefaciens</i> is a well-known bacterial species to produce proteinases. The comparison, regarding the proteinase productivity, between the current isolate and the others should be included.	1. These two points are valuable and are addressed as results of purification process in the subsequent two manuscripts. 2. Similar study done on <i>Bacillus amyloliquefaciens</i> is added to the manuscript, check lines 435-441
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. Some sentences are difficult to understand so they should be rephrased. Line 38, "Alkaline proteases comprise 15.6% nitrogen..." Line 70-71, "...using one variable at time approach the statistical approach of proteases produced by..." 2. "Gram staining" rather than "gram staining"	1. These comments were considered and taken into action. 2. Done
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1. Figure 3 is not necessary to be included. 2. Results obtained from response surface methodology can be included in the current manuscript.	1. Illustration by Figure 3 is enhanced using a higher-resolution gel picture. 2. RSM experiments are done and will be published in a subsequent manuscript.