



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_25074
Title of the Manuscript:	Alternative Routes to Homoserine Activation and Sulfuration: Critical Steps in Methionine Biosynthesis
Type of the Article	Review paper

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		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The manuscript is very-well written. Just some minor revisions are required as in following prior to manuscript acceptance for publication:- 1. To include the keywords of “enzyme mechanisms; enzyme evolution; enzyme structures” under Abstract. Those key words are not found under Abstract section. 2. Please include references citations to the Fig. captions i.e. in Fig. 1, 2, 4, 9, 10, 11, 12 and also reference for Table. 1 caption. 3. Suggest the author to re-serialise some paragraphs in an order of reference made in the manuscript in accordance to the list of references. i.e. Reference [90, 91] appears earlier than Reference [88, 81] under Line 530, 531. Similar goes to Reference [37, 41] under Line item# 160 etc..Need a minor clean-up. Thanks!	1. The keywords have been moved from page 1 to page 2 under the Abstract. 2. The appropriate reference citations have been added to the Figures. Figure 2 is an original figure drawn specifically for this article and has no other citation, and the reference for Table 1 was already included. 3. References [88, 81] and [37,41] were cited earlier in the manuscript in their correct order, and are now repeated on these later lines.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Very-well written review paper in terms of content!	