



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_47132
Title of the Manuscript:	Identification of Hemin binding protein of oral streptococci via electrophoresis in SDS polyacrylamide gel
Type of the Article	Short Research 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>)



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		
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Title should be written "Identification of hemin-binding protein..." instead of "Identification of Hemin binding protein...." * In abstract, it should be written "the aim of this study..." instead of "the purpose of this study.." * were the bacteria used commercially? If so, should be written in abstract, and material and methods * the source number (11) must be removed in the last sentence of the introduction * In material and methods (2.2), not sarcosyl, is sarkosyl, and commercial company and information must be added * In material and methods (2.2), TN buffer abbreviation usable on line 11 * In material and methods (2.2), not centrifuge, is centrifuged on line 17 * In material and methods (2.2), sample buffer content can be added on line 18 * In material and methods (2.2), time and volts or ampere of the execution operation should be added on line 20 * should be written Figure 1A instead of Figure 1 in line 2 of results and discussion * should be written "these results have suggested that...." Instead of "these results suggest that..." in last sentence of second paragraph of results and discussion * The first 2 rows in figure 1 should be deleted because not need * All reference list must be written according to journal's rules 	<p>Thank you for your review.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * The title was changed to "Identification of hemin-binding protein ..." instead of "Identification of hemin binding protein ..." * In abstract (line 3), it was changed to "the aim of this study..." instead of "the purpose of this study..." * Bacterias were not used commercially. * In the last line of introduction, source number 11 was removed. * In materials and methods (2.2), sarcosyl was converted to sarkosyl, and the commercial company and information of sarkosyl was written (line 12 and 14). We have also attached commercial companies and information about the substances which have not been written (line 4, 5 and 12). * In materials and methods (2.2), TN buffer abbreviations were all changed to Tris-NaCl buffer (lines 11 and 17). * in materials and methods (2.2), the "centrifuge" was changed to "centrifuged" (line 18). In material and method (2.2), sample buffer content was added to line 19. * In materials and methods (2.2), we added the time and volt or amperage of the run in line 21. * In results and discussion (3), we have changed from Figure 1 to Figure 1A and Figure 1B (lines 2, 3, 5, 6, 7 and 9). * In results and discussion (3), it was changed to " these results have suggested that ..." instead of "these results suggest that ..." (line 16). * The first two lines in Figure 1 have been deleted. * All bibliographic references are written according to the rules of the journal.
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

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

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>