



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	2014_BMRJ_15504
Title of the Manuscript:	Purification, characterization and applications of proteases produced by <i>Bacillus amyloliquefaciens</i> 35s isolated 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Regarding the scientific backgrounds, the paper is good, however the style should be improved by respecting the English writing. Some statements are strongly affirmative and this style might be avoided in scientific publications (see page 9 line 340 highlighted expression). Comparison with savinase is not really convincing (see page 10 line 406 -408). All highlighted text in the paper needs drastic corrections. Results were compared with some previous works but the discussion is not strongly stressed to show what the authors want the readers to know about their research.	Regarding the strong affirmative, I agree with the review's opinion, regarding line 340, and that line has been changed (highlighted). Regarding Lines 406-408, these lines are just describing results, and no affirmative words were used in this part. Regarding the highlighted comments, some of these comments represent personal points of view, rather than right-or-wrong arguments. So, I had to disagree with some of these comments Moreover, in some of the highlighted comments, the review did not mentioned what is needed in those notes, for example lines 279-280. Discussing the results was written in concise format and we did not want to expand it so that the paper be longer than enough.
Minor REVISION comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments	I was expecting that the authors could really reach all the publications in the field, but unfortunately I did not feel it. This is a typical article on the Feather hydrolysis which was carried out in my lab, but the authors could not include in their literature. Feather wastes digestion by new isolated strains of Bacillus sp. in Morocco. Ilham ZERDANI Mohamed FAID and Abderahim MALKI . African Journal of Biotechnology Vo I. 3 (1), pp. 67-70, January 2004. http://hdl.handle.net/1807/3495	I don't think it is necessary or logic to use of cite all publications related to the study, no one does that. It is enough to relate the results to the most recent and most related studies to the current research. The reviewer is pointing out to cite a specific publication; I don't know what the point of that is. Our article has seven (7) references about degradation of feather waste.
----------------------------------	---	---