



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_46842
Title of the Manuscript:	PRODUCTION OF BIOETHANOL FROM SELECTED LIGNOCELLULOSIC AGROWASTES
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

**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>The paper was generally a good one with interesting findings. However, it has some limitations</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The introduction is too short, just 9 lines from a paper of 35 pages. The introduction did not capture the major components of the research. No deep literature review was mentioned in the introduction</li> <li>2. The paper recorded just 21 references in a paper of 35 pages. One would have expected more references</li> </ol>	<p>The introduction has increased from 9 lines to 47 lines with more literatures added</p> <p>References has now increased from 21 to 45, an improvement to the previous one cited</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>Full meaning of FUTA on line 37 must be written and state its longitude and latitude Equations on lines 82 and 110 must be numbered eq 1 and 2 respectively. The authors should do a thorough reading again and separate some separate words that got joined together</p>	<p>The full meaning of FUTA (Federal University of Technology, Akure) with latitude and longitude has been included, equations 1 and 2 has been labelled correctly, thorough reading was done, words that were joined together in the articles have been separated</p>
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>In the conclusion part, the authors should use efficiency instead of efficacy.</p>	<p>Efficiency has replaced efficacy in the conclusion part. Thank you</p>

**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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	