Jentashapir Journal of Cellular and Molecular Biology
Volume 14 · Issue 1 · e132400

OPEN PEER REVIEW

In silico Analysis of Molecular Phylogeny of Genes Involved in the Synthesis of Bioactive Compounds in Cyanobacteria Strains Located in Tehran Cascade

Bahareh Nowruzi, Ghazal Afshari

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
15 Oct 2022	26 Dec 2022	10 Jan 2023	10.5812/jjcmb-132400

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 Original submission Maniya Arshadi 2
2 Revision 1 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 5

1 Original submission

1 comment · 20 Nov 2022

Maniya Arshadi Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 20 Nov 2022

This paper describes “In silico analysis of molecular phylogeny of genes involved in the synthesis of bioactive compounds in cyanobacteria strains located in Tehran cascade;”. This study is useful in that it can help identify important bacterial metabolites in the pharmaceutical industry. But the article has technical and writing problems that need to be corrected.

I offer suggestions to improve the quality of the manuscript further:

• Please double-check English grammar and spelling with the assistance of an expert.
• In the abstract section: please write the full names of NRPS and PKS and put the abbreviations in parentheses.
•
• Lines 201 to 207 of the introduction need to be rewritten (typing error).

• Please provide manufacturer details for the culture media (method section).

• Line 232 (CTAB method): Please mention the reference.

• In the results section: Give a separate heading called Results.

• Figures and tables need serious revision. There are two tables labeled 1. In lines 345, 432 and 472, tables 1, 2 and 3 are mentioned, but they do not appear in the article.

• The results section is long and contains many tables, whereas the discussion section is very brief and insufficient. It is necessary to refer to more studies and finally draw conclusions.

• Please discuss the limitations and strengths of the study in the discussion section.

• Please read the paper carefully and pay attention to small mistakes.

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Respected Editor-in-Chief of the journal.....
Dear Dr. ....
Greetings and respect,
With many thanks for the useful comments of the respected reviewers, all corrections were applied in the main text of the article in accordance with the reviewers' comments.
In addition, all comments will be answered one by one.
Respectfully,
Dr. Bahareh Nowroozi

Reviewer 1:

This paper describes “In silico analysis of molecular phylogeny of genes involved in the synthesis of bioactive compounds in cyanobacteria strains located in Tehran cascade;”. This study is useful in that it can be useful in identifying important bacterial metabolites in the pharmaceutical industry. But the article has technical and writing problems that need to be corrected. I offer suggestions to improve the quality of the manuscript further:

• Please double-check English grammar and spelling with the assistance of an expert.
With many thanks for the respected reviewer's comment, the entire text was revised by an English language specialist.
• In abstract section: please write the full name of NRPS and PKS and put the abbreviation in parentheses
We agree with the respected reviewer's comment. The changes were applied in the text.
• Lines 201 to 207 of the introduction need to be rewritten (typing error).
With many thanks, the text was corrected.
• Please provide manufacture details for culture media (method section).
Respectfully, it was added.
• line 232 (CTAB method): Please mention the reference
Respectfully, it was added.
• In results section: Give a separate title called results
Respectfully, it was added.
• Figures and tables need serious revision. There are two tables 1. In lines 345, 432 and 472, tables1, 2 and 3 are mentioned, which are not seen in the article.
With many thanks for the respected reviewer's attention to detail. The figures and tables in the text were corrected and renumbered.
• The results section is long and there are many tables, and unlike them, the discussion section is very brief and insufficient. It is necessary to refer to more studies and finally draw conclusions. Please discuss the limitations and strengths of the study in the discussion section. Please read carefully the paper and pay attention to small mistakes.
We completely agree with the reviewer's comment. The important results were applied in the text, and in addition to rewriting the discussion section, other important content was added.
•

Reviewer 2:

Dear authors
I found the manuscript to be overall well described. But there are many structural problems in this manuscript, please correct them.
1. The manuscript should be revised for linguistic, grammatical and style errors.
(The written rules related to the journal’s instruction have not been followed. Different errors are seen in your manuscript.)
With many thanks for the respected reviewer's comment, the entire text was revised by an English language specialist.2. The main framework of the manuscript is not observed in this article. for example, the discussion section is not seen in this manuscript.
We completely agree with the respected reviewer's comment. The text was corrected.

2 Revision 1

0 comments

No public comments in this round.