



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Food Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AFSJ_49061
Title of the Manuscript:	Optimization of process parameters for production of alkaline protease by OVAT method using isolated strain Alternaria alternata TUSGF1
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	<p>There are some major comments should be addressed by authors. Therefore, The manuscript could be accepted after addressing these corrections.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The authors should look in details for the wrong words, grammatical errors, punctuations, spaces and units throughout the manuscript. In addition, some sentences are poorly written. Please change it accordingly. 2. Abstract: the abstract should comprise of background, aim of the work, methodology, significant results and conclusion. Please, correct the abstract accordingly. Moreover, (the current study aimed at studying) should be corrected to be (the current study aimed to study). Please, could you clarify how you studied the optimization via origin software? I think you would say, the results was analysed via origin software. The abstract should be carefully revised and rewritten. 3. Materials and methods: you should describe the methodology in details; for instance, which substrate did you apply for protease assay? 4. Results and discussion: the authors are encouraged to discuss and compare their results with the previous studies. I found out the authors mentioned their results and add a few references without discussion. Please, this section should be supported by recent references. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Thank you for your suggestions. All suggestions are addressed in revised manuscript. 2. Thank you for your suggestions. The abstract is re-written in revised manuscript. 3. Discussion is re-written as per your suggestion. 4. Current references are inserted in discussion section as per your suggestion in revised manuscript.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

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