



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BMRJ_25368
Title of the Manuscript:	Differential expression pattern of heat shock protein genes in toxigenic and atoxigenic isolate of <i>Aspergillus flavus</i>.
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	1. The relationship between expression of aflatoxin and expression of heat shock protein should be described. 2. The comparison of expression of heat shock protein should be also analysed by western blotting or ELISA assay. 3. The comparison of expression of heat shock protein should be analysed by using both wild-type and aflR and aflS mutant <i>Aspergillus flavus</i>. Otherwise, several (at least 5) aflatoxin positive and aflatoxin negative <i>Aspergillus flavus</i> should be analysed the expression of heat shock protein, respectively. Statistical analysis of these results is needed to clarify author's hypothesis. Only two <i>Aspergillus flavus</i> were not enough to conclude.	1. We agree with reviewer. We have described the relationship between aflatoxin and temperature, and subsequently as a stress with heat shock protein and added part in manuscript have been highlighted with yellow colour. 2. We agree with reviewer that similar work at protein level strengthen data. However, current work is on transcripts level, so we did not carry out. Hope, work done on transcripts encoding for heat shock protein genes using real-time PCR should be considered as solely work done on transcripts are also publishable. 3. We have carried out these on two different isolates, however adding more isolates should add confirmation to the data. In this case data from two isolates should not be ruled out. Several reports are



SDI Review Form 1.6

		published based on two isolates also. We agree with reviewer that study on wild-type and aflR and aflS mutant <i>Aspergillus flavus</i> is important, though it is very descriptive and time consuming with limited success rate. However, current data represents the first line of data on which future work can be done. Hence, studies based on transcript, as in our case, should be allowed to publish so that reader can have the information about the importance of heat shock protein gene in relation to biosynthesis of aflatoxin.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This topics is potential interesting.	We thank reviewer for the suggestions and for their critical review.