

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JABB_100258</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Protein Expression in Synechococcus PCC 7002: a quantitative comparison of promoters and integration sites</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</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:

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

## Review Form 1.7

### 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  1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>  <b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b>	<p>Protein Expression in <i>Synechococcus</i> PCC 7002: a quantitative comparison of promoters and integration sites (Ms_JABB_100258) Following are the suggestions to the author(s) need to be incorporated : <input type="checkbox"/>Somewhere name of the author and number both are given in the text instead of reference number only. <input type="checkbox"/>From which place <i>Synechococcus</i> sp. originally collected. It is to be mentioned. <input type="checkbox"/>In Table 1 &amp; 2 Kachel &amp; Mack, 2020 reference is given but not in the form of reference number. In the text, citations should be indicated by the reference number in brackets. <input type="checkbox"/>In Table 1 &amp; 2 Kachel &amp; Mack, 2020 reference is given in the Tables but missing in the Reference list. It is to be incorporated. <input type="checkbox"/>In Table 1 &amp; 2 everywhere in the source column written This work. Instead of This work the word This Study may be used. <input type="checkbox"/>Last Photo of Fig. 4 is not very clear. It is to be replaced by some good quality photomicrograph. <input type="checkbox"/>The discussion part is given in the conclusion. It is to be corrected. <input type="checkbox"/>Reference number 12 is given in the conclusion. It should be in Discussion. <input type="checkbox"/>Conclusion should be written in the proper way giving reasonable details of findings only. <input type="checkbox"/>Future Perspectives and application of the present study should be incorporated. <input type="checkbox"/>References should be given in the uniform format as per the format of the Journal.</p> <p>Manuscript required revision as suggested.</p>	<p>We changed respective sentences.</p> <p>Our source is: Erb Group, MPI for Terrestrial Microbiology, Marburg, Germany This is the only information we have.</p> <p>It has been changed in both tables Is incorporated now.</p> <p>The last photo of Fig. 4 is of high quality. It is not fuzzy and 100% in focus. As described in the ms-text, the GFP fluorescence is high in the center of the bacteria and diffuses at the cell border.</p> <p>Corrected.</p> <p>That has been changed accordingly.</p> <p>That is mentioned in „Conclusions“</p> <p>Changed.</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>		
<b>Optional/General</b> 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	