



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Microbiology Research Journal</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BMRJ_22959
Title of the Manuscript:	OVERPRODUCTION OF XYLANASE FROM MUTANTS OF <i>Bacillus subtilis</i> USING BARLEY HUSK AS THE PRIME CARBON SOURCE IN SUBMERGED FERMENTATION AFTER RANDOM MUTAGENESIS OF ETHYL METHANE SULFONATE (EMS) AND ACRIDINE ORANGE (AO)
Type of the Article	Original research Articles

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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The aim of the research is clear, only the manner they are expressed and discussed the results is not clear, it is much discussion on the subject, but much of this discussion is not related to the results shown, I believe that the results can be organized in a better way and discuss directly, for example the graphs do not allow to understand the results, plus not described in detail at the manuscript; the lines 279 to 365 only review the literature, but is not related with neither result presented in the manuscript. Which is the parameter to consider an overproduction of xylanase? I believe that the results do not show this overproduction of xylanase.	Results from the literature review were used to compare the results obtained in the present study. Discussion of the results was presented clearly in Results and Discussion in the revised manuscript. The overproduction of xylanase was determined using enzyme activity. It was explained clearly in the manuscript under Results and Discussion. Based on the results, all of the mutants were observed to possess their own maximum xylanase activity under the same growth conditions at 24 h of fermentation. Notably, the maximum xylanase activity of 1.76 U/mL by the mutant MXB 4 of <i>B. subtilis</i> was attained compared to the xylanase production of the wild type with 1.36 U/mL. Indeed, this maximum xylanase activity from the MXB 4 was increased by approximately 1.3-fold compared to the wild type. Furthermore, MXB 1, MXB 2, MXB 3 and MXB 5 also exhibited relatively higher maximum xylanase activity of 1.64 U/mL, 1.73 U/mL, 1.74 U/mL and 1.66 U/mL in comparison with their parental wild type of 1.36 U/mL.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		