



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 <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		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Dears: The paper -Alternative Routes to Homoserine Activation and Sulfuration: Critical Steps in Methionine Biosynthesis- it is very interesting, and explains very well as the mode of activation of homoserine differs from plants to microorganisms, as well as within different microbial systems. The authors explain, depending on the species, at least three different activation routes, have been identified. In addition, the route of sulfur assimilation in these systems can also vary from species to species. Also, the authors studied the chemical mechanisms and the enzyme catalysis of different families of homoserine acyl transferases. For this reason, this work is acceptable from every point of view to be published in International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review. Only suggest minor corrections:	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Corrections: -Line 03. Title: Please, The title does not guide the reader. The title is poor and does not define where is directed the study of enzyme activity (bacteria, fungi, plants, other living organisms, etc., i.e., See Conclusion in Line 32, and conclusions in Line 520, page 18. Please, review the title. -Line 60 and 61, Fig 1.: Please, Review the quality of the figure 1, and check the diagram. -Line 119. Please, Review the quality of the figure 2. -Line 118 and 129. Please, Check the location of the figures 2 and 3 For example: and in all enteric...????????..... bacteria, including <i>E. coli</i>,..... -Line 405. Please, Review the quality of the table 1. -Line 446 and 447. Please, Review the quality of the figure 9.	The alternative routes described in this paper are from different microbial species. The word “microbial” has been inserted in the title. Figures 1, 2, and 9, as well as Table 1 have been replaced with higher resolution versions. Figures 2 & 3 are each referenced for the first time on page 4, and are located on the two pages that immediately follow. Unfortunately, because these are each full page figures, this causes a large break in the text from the bottom of page 4 to the top of page 7. The reference to Figure 4 on page 4 has been removed to eliminate an even larger gap in the text.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		