



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biotechnology and Genetic Engineering
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJBGE_47047
Title of the Manuscript:	New Documentary of Acid-Stable Glutaminase Production by an Efficient Acidophilic Aspergillus niger CPGM 1439
Type of the Article	Original research 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>There are many results in the manuscript, different condition were assayed. However, the Materials and Methods section was poorly written, which became difficult to understand how the experiments were planning.</p> <p>Introduction: The authors could improve the introduction clarifying why the interest in an acid-stable enzyme and justify the food choice for fungi isolation.</p> <p>Materials and methods are incomplete. Much information and procedures are lacking. This section needs to be improved to clarify the understanding of results and discussion. The fungi were isolated from where? How was the procedure? The cultivation conditions are not described. How was the extracellular enzyme obtained? What were the standard conditions that you called "control"? The tests were conducted in duplicate?</p> <p>Discussion section: The 5 fungi were found in all products? Tables and Figures are not cited in the text. Figures are in low resolution to review. I suggest changing "enzyme productivity" for "enzyme activity". In bioprocess, the expression "productivity" is used to calculate the product formation with time.</p> <p>In the test starting with pH 1.5 there was a large increase to pH 5.3. What could be the explanation for this? I would like to see the biomass and enzyme production curve. It would be possible to link more information about the process. After all, it was 7 days of experiment; no data was collected during these days?</p> <p>Fig 2. Explain the carbon source "water".</p> <p>After all these tests, what is the final producing condition?</p> <p>The manuscript needs to be carefully revised to correct some duplicate words and other mistakes. Some sentences need to be rewritten like this: "In view of the findings of the other workers, many sources utilized found to be glutaminase inhibitors like fructose, sucrose (Desai <i>et al.</i>, 2016) lactose and starch were found to have inhibitory effect on glutaminase"</p>	<p>The production was done primarily in 250 ml conical flask containing 50 ml broth medium having the same constituent as that for isolation except agar. Sterilization was carried out and inoculation with 1ml of spore suspension of each isolate.</p> <p>This paragraph has been added in the production of enzyme method.</p> <p>2- Source of isolation is cleared in results of isolation 3- cultivation was carried on slants of the same medium 4- the extracellular enzyme obtained by filtration as crude enzyme 4- Control means without addition of the newly added factor as all experiments are in ordered manner and worked sequentially on the basis of the results of each experiment the next experiment was done. This is mean that, if substance had increased the productivity more than the previous last experiment it was fixed and next experiment was made along with it. 5- Enzyme productivity means the factor affect the ability of the organism ability to produce the enzyme. It called activity after purification. 6- Yes, only 5 isolates were obtained as it is very low pH, this was the aim. 7- In the pH there was increase from 1.5 and then decreases gradually. The difference in the pH was minor nearly the productivity was constant from pH3.5. It must be recorded as it was see, this was the obtained result. 7 days was the optimum time for enzyme production. Only the enzyme productivity was monitored in this stage. Growth and protein will be measured in the next stages in our work. 8- In carbon sources it is water hyacinth. I cleared it. 9- The final producing conditions is cleared in the abstract. 10- Many written mistakes have been corrected.</p>
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	