



# GLOBAL PRESS HUB

---

## GPH Review Form

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Biosciences</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJORIB_1544</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Fungi and Bacteria Strain Fermentation Comparison for Bioethanol Production from Waste Paper Using E.Coli and S.Cerevisiae Species.</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Short Research Article</b>

## [GPH Review Form](#)

### **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><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments  <b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  <b>6. 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>The manuscript is important for scientific community because it designed an alternative solution for sustainable waste management and energy recovery.</p> <p>No. it nis expected that the content of the manuscript (especially, results and discussions) Cover the title. It author would endeavour to give a detailed comparative analysis on the result, then, the topic should be 'Comparative Study/Analysis for Bioethanol Production from Waste Paper Using <i>E.Coli</i> and <i>S.Cerevisiae</i> Specie'. Otherwise, it should be 'Bioethanol Production from Waste Paper Using <i>E.Coli</i> and <i>S.Cerevisiae</i> Species'. Also, author should remove the full stop after title.</p> <p>Abstract is not comprehensive enough.</p> <p>Subsections are well structured but contents are not comprehensive enough. For instance, keywords are not well captured under materials and methods neither were the literature reviews done during introduction.</p> <p>Yes, it is. However, this manuscript would be better if the followings are attended to.</p> <p>Introduction: Author should rephrase the statement 'it takes thousands of years for the earth to form and live in a fixed amount' and avoid quoting the source verbatim. Author only gave definition of few terms in the manuscript instead of a comprehensive literature review on each keyword.</p> <p>Materials and Methods: Author should remove the statement 'The following instruments were employed: Autoclave, Centrifuge, Digital Balance, Digital PH Meter, Flasks of various sizes, and Graduated containers of various sizes, Scissors, incubator, and rotary evaporator'. Also, author should make the experimental procedure for hydrolysis more explanatory</p> <p>Results and discussion: The experimental procedure should explain the samples in detail and differentiate between 'paper A4' and 'hard paper' for better understanding. Authors are allowed to present result in tables, pictures, charts and so on but one in allowed to use only one to present a given result- not two or more (check authors guideline for details) as observed under results and discussion. Some of the explanations made under energy conservation should have appeared in materials and methods with references. So, author should move it to materials and methods while a detailed discussion of results be made under sub section 5.2.</p> <p>References: References are sufficient but not recent and not correctly stated. Therefore, author is advised to consult and adopt journal's recommended guidelines.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments  <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly</b>	<p>Yes</p>	



# GLOBAL PRESS HUB

## [GPH Review Form](#)

communications?		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The author should avoid full stop after statements before sitting references. Also, there is the need to review the manuscript by author to correct the typographical errors (for instance, author expressed 60 <sup>0</sup> C as '60 0C'; 'scissors' as 'scissor' e.t.c.). In addition, author should ensure using the same unit and must be SI units,	Okay

## **PART 2:**

	<b><u>Reviewer's comment</u></b>	<b><u>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)</u></b>
<b><u>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u></b>	<b><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></b>	