



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Biotechnology and Genetic Engineering</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJBGE_47047</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>New Documentary of Acid-Stable Glutaminase Production by an Efficient Acidophilic Aspergillus niger CPGM 1439</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original research paper</b>

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> 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><b>Introduction:</b> 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><b>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.</b> 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><b>Discussion section:</b> 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><b>Fig 2. Explain the carbon source "water".</b></p> <p><b>After all these tests, what is the final producing condition?</b></p> <p><b>The manuscript needs to be carefully revised to correct some duplicate words and other mistakes.</b> <b>Some sentences need to be rewritten like this:</b> "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>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> 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>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b><i>Patrícia Poletto</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>Federal University of Santa Catarina, Brazil</i></b>