



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_38730
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF BIOETHANOL POTENTIAL OF LEMON GRASS
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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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	<p>Abstract "The GC-MS analysis of the bioethanol produced shows the presence of Ethyl alcohol (bioethanol) in all the samples at different pH." This is an obvious statement. It would be better to comment about the quantity, or behaviour as acidity changed. Maybe the in the title, the term "bioethanol" should be replaced by "bioenergy", since some comments on energy-potential compounds that are not alcohol. Actually, no data was presented in abstract.</p> <p>Introduction Sugarcane is a grass and a very important energy source in Brazil and it was not mentioned. No strong justification why lemon grass should be evaluated for energy purposes. Cost, land availability, fuel price in the country would make sense.</p> <p>Material and methods No details about the lemon grass. In which phenological phase it was when harvested? Moisture, yield? Was it grew or found out in the woods?</p> <p>Discussion No data to support that lemon grass would be a good energy source. How much it would be the cost of a litre, how many litres per hectare, how much lemon grass is produced. Bioenergy is a low-value-aggregated product so these are fundamental data.</p>	All observation noted and thank you.
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Material and Methods 121oC and 588nm should have an space between numbers and units.</p> <p>Results Table 1 - third line is redundant. The information is already in the table title. Figure 1 - which is the meaning of presenting this figure with a line? There is no link among the components. Another king of graph would make more sense (e.g. pizza style). Besides, an attached table presented the values, which is redundant. The table alone would be better. Tables 1 and 2 could compose a single one. Fig 2 and Table 3 bring the same data. Please choose just one. Figures and tables were mentioned after being presented. "There was no significant difference at 0.05% level of significance..." is redundant... suggestion "There was no difference (p > 0.05)..." Discussion Replace "...with no significant differences between the samples at p>0.05." by "with no differences between the samples (p>0.05)".</p>	
Optional/General comments	No novelty presented and lack of arguments to justify why lemon grass would be a good energy source.	