



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBcRR_20593
Title of the Manuscript:	PURIFICATION AND CHARACTERIZATION OF ENDOGLUCANASE FROM SORGHUM (S. bi-color) AND MILLET (Pennisetum typhoides & Digitaria exilis) MALTS
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		
Minor REVISION comments	The Manuscript Ms_IJBcRR_20593 PURIFICATION AND CHARACTERIZATION OF ENDOGLUCANASE FROM SORGHUM (S. bi-color) AND MILLET (Pennisetum typhoides & Digitaria exilis) MALTS discussed the purification and characterisation of Endoglucanase from three different sources. The authors need to consider the following comments and incorporate it in the manuscript. 1. The manuscript contains some typographical errors that need to be corrected. For example in Line 95, "by " can be removed. 2. The work fixed the optimum pH range 4.5 to 6.5. Say the specific reason for fixing the PH in this range. 3. Are the calcium and magnesium ions stimulating endoglucanase activity? 4. The authors concluded that Kaura and dauro are the more suitable for malting process. The authors should include the optimum conditions for malting process and it is concluded in the conclusion part.	We quite appreciate the time and thoroughness given to our work. Your comments are indeed splendid and have helped to beef up the work. We are grateful to you Sir. Our actions to your comments 1. "by " removed in Line 95 2. The specific optimum pH instead of the range stated for each plant - <i>The purified enzymes catalyzed the hydrolysis of carboxy-methylcellulose with optimum activity at pH of 4.8, 5.0, 6.0 for fonio, kaura and Dauro respectively.</i> 3. Calcium, Barium and Zinc ions <u>enhanced</u> enzyme activity, <u>not stimulated</u>. 4. Optimum pH and temperature included. 5. Plate 1.0 corrected to fig 7.0 6. The comparisons of the effects of pH, temperature, percentage residual activity, divalent cations were discussed under different sub-headings, which are regarded as more ideal for enzyme work and judging from several publications. Tabulating the effects also will amount to duplication of results (graphs and tables). Once again, thank you Sir for a job well done.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	5. The figure number of the last graph in line 450 is not given. 6. The authors must tabulate the effects like pH, temperature on enzyme activity, percentage residual activity of endoglucanase , divalent cation influence etc, comparen the three sources and include in the results and discuddions. -----	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		