



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_43040
Title of the Manuscript:	Amylolytic activities excreted by the halophilic archaeon Haloferax mediterranei to assimilate available starch depend on the nitrogen source.
Type of the 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>)

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	<p>Nor in the abstract or in the introduction sections appeared the aim or Objective of the research, suggest establishing them in both sections.</p> <p>Figure 6 and 7 should be more clearly and well represented, 'cause the ones presented in the paper aren't of good quality for a publication.</p>	<p>We thank very much your interest in our work. We have revised our manuscript and tried to include all your suggestions in the revised text.</p> <p>Here we include the specific points and their corresponding revisions changes:</p> <p>- About the comment about nor in the abstract or in the introduction sections appeared the aim or objective of the research, we have included in both sections these general objectives that we consider made interesting to investigate this aspects of the use of starch as carbon and energy source. In the abstract section: "The study of the presence and behavior of this set of starch degrading enzymes will allow us a better understanding of how our halophilic organism obtains the adequate carbohydrates to be incorporated and optimally used." And in the introduction section: "The degradation of starch in the adequate way, previous to its assimilation appears to be essential for its optimal use. The aim of this study of the implied enzymes was a deeper understanding of how the organism succeed in getting profit of the starch, in different conditions of growth, with different nitrogen sources."</p> <p>We hope these changes may help to understand the importance of knowing more about how organisms "success" in extreme conditions and restricted available sources of materials and energy to survive.</p> <p>- About the figures 6 and 7, we have tried to enhance their presentation, including a clearer labelling of the lanes. In figure 6, we have tried to eliminate the background "noise" of the picture, spots and shadows that prevent better appreciate the information contained in it</p> <p>In figure 7, just the same than on the previous figure, and also we have enhance the shape of the bands in lane1, corresponding to the molecular</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

		<p>weight markers, only changes that do not affect the position of the bands, trying to made the less changes as possible in order to maintain unchanged the real experimental results we obtained and discussed in the manuscript.</p> <p>Initially, in the first manuscript, we decided to include these images (in the original, previous to revision, manuscript) without changes, in order to let you see the frequent problems that we have to endure when working with halophilic samples. The presence of salts makes more difficult to apply those techniques than they are with plain samples. Little difference in salt concentrations in the samples due to possible precipitation of salt, proteins, etc, may cause distortion of the lanes, as well as less defined spots or bands, making gels less clear. That also may affect the calculation of protein, leading a miscalculations on the amounts to be applied in gel, as seen in lane 6 of the gel. In fact, out of the great number of gels and TLCs, these included in the figures six and seven where the best we had obtained, the more clear that included in one gel, made in the same experiment, all the samples included in the discussion. Although we get lot of gels and TLCs with part of the samples, we think that we may compare them better and more reliable, "trustworthy" if they have been tested in the same gel or TLC, furthermore when differences between them seem to be so little.</p>
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	