

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_97291
Title of the Manuscript:	Isolation of uricase enzyme from Bacillus subtilis SP6 bacteria for application in uric acid assay diagnostic kit
Type of the Article	Original 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:

<https://journaljabb.com/index.php/JABB/editorial-policy>)

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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	1. Yes, this manuscript is important for health science community. The results may help cut the cost of uric acid reagent kit in the future. 2. The words "bacteria" and "enzyme" in the title should be removed. 3. No, there are too much clinical significance of hyperuricemia while this study emphasized on the uricase extraction. Furthermore, this part lacked of materials and method or study design and showed little results. 4. No, similar to the abstract, the Introduction contained lots of health impacts of hyperuricemia even though the study was about uricase extraction. The authors should review the chemical and physical properties of uricase. Since the animal livers used in this study were bought from a local slaughter-house and were stored in -40°C after left at the room temperature for a period of time, Were the researchers sure for the stability of uricase in them? Moreover, what is the SP6? The authors should give this information for readers who are not in the microbiology field. 5. Yes. 6. No, as mentioned above the authors should rather review the chemical and physical properties of uricase and study bacteria than the clinical significance of hyperuricemia. To do so, references will not be sufficient. If not, in this manuscript, some of the references are not recent.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Need some improvement.	
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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Veeravan Lekskulchai
Department, University & Country	Srinakharinwirot University, Thailand