



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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<p>The work is very poorly written, with several errors. Abstract: - Punctuation and grammar need to be reviewed; - Authors need to revise the abstract, it is very confusing; - Authors could use another word to replace "etc"; - The statement is confusing; - What treatment? - What is the concentration of these minerals? - Authors need to add "%" Introduction - Authors need to revise the introduction, it is very confusing; - Authors need to reference this information; - What are the recent studies? - Authors need to reference this information; - Punctuation and grammar need to be reviewed; - Authors need to reference this information. - The statement is confusing; - The aim or purpose of this paper is confusing; - This is necessary. The journal notes the presence of specific objectives - Specific objectives are related to scientific initiation of graduations in universities; - What is the purpose of this stage? - How big are the samples? - The method is based on "Sebayang et al., 2016"? - The authors need to explain more clearly the form of pretreatment, for example: "Mechanical process" or "Extrusion process" or "Ultrasonic process" - Sebayang et al., 2016. A Prospective of Bioethanol Production from Biomass as Alternative Fuel for Spark Ignition Engine, RSC Advances " - It is incorrectly referenced - "Sebayang et al., 2016"; - This statement is theoretical foundation or part of the discussion. "Phytochemical Screening and Proximate Analysis - involved the estimation of the main components of food using procedures that allow a reasonably rapid and acceptable measurement of various food fractions. In this analysis moisture content, ash, crude protein, carbohydrates, lipids and mineral content of the grass species was determined using standardized methods (Amina et al., 2013). Hydrothermal explosion method was applied for the pretreatment of the samples as described by Adagatin et al., (2015) where twenty (20) grams of pulverized grass (<i>C. citratus</i>) was mashed with hammer and measured using weighing balance." - Punctuation and grammar need to be reviewed; - The authors did not add this reference; - The statement is confusing; - Who are these Hydrolytic Organisms? - The authors need to better describe this step. - Macro kjeldahl distillation apparatus - What is the brand of the equipment? - The figure 1 should be redone; - The figure 2 have font different; "However, the results for proximate analysis presented in Figure I indicated that carbohydrate content is much higher (87.81) followed by crude proteins (8.69), Moisture content(7.17), Ash (1.17), fibres (2.8) and lipid (3.67). " - - Punctuation and grammar need to be reviewed. - "Figure 1" - Authors need to add "%"; - Punctuation and grammar need to be reviewed - - "Figure 2" or "Figure II" or "figure 2" or "figure II"?</p>	<p>All observations are noted and corrections will be affected. Thank you for the time a wonderful review.</p>



	<p>"The significant difference between pH shows that the absorbance for spectrometric analysis is high at pH8 than pH of 5 and 7. However, the significant difference for absorbance of reducing sugar too is higher in pH7 and 8 than pH of 5. There was no significant difference at 0.05% level of significance between volumes of the samples at different pH level." - Authors need to add statistical analysis to this statement.</p> <p>Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- The authors did not add this reference- Punctuation and grammar need to be reviewed. <p>"5</p> <p>The presence of minerals and nutrient in the plant samples used in the analysis favours the means of the fermentative yeast, because as a living constituent for its activity to take place there is need for some basis such as protein, carbohydrates lipids, moisture and minerals (Potassium, Magnesium, Calcium and Sodium) for the life processes and physiological activities of the yeast to take place. This also helps in the fermentation processes. For example in transportation or cellular activities happening in and out of the cells the presence of Potasium, Sodium and Calcium serves as a transportation channel. - This statement needs to be referenced;</p> <p>"... carbohydrates too". - Punctuation and grammar need to be reviewed.</p> <p>"However, the presence of different polymeric substances (hemicellulose) on the cell wall justifies the need for pre-treatment on waste" - This statement needs to be referenced</p> <p>"2016. Ash content depend on the plant type, water uptake, inorganic sources from the environment or fertilizer used particularly with regard to element (Potasium, Chlorine, Phosphourus) soil conditions, or part of the plants where leaves has the highest ash content." - This statement needs to be referenced</p> <p>"lemongrass, which ...". - Punctuation and grammar need to be reviewed.</p> <p>"According to Shah and Touseef, (2014), the production of Bioethanol from various biomass sources usually needs pretreatment, hydrolysis (sachharification) followed by simple fermentation process which is performed by various strains of yeast and bacteria (Cao et al., 2014; Cheng et al., 2007; Pasha et al., 2007)." - Is this statement of which reference?</p> <p>"According to Yuelel et al., 2012," - The authors did not add this reference</p> <p>"it will lead to significant economic and environmental benefits (Galistsky et al., 2002)." - Punctuation and grammar need to be reviewed; - The authors did not add this reference;</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>"CONCLUSSION" - - Authors should review the conclusion of the paper</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Punctuation and grammar need to be reviewed.- No references are used in the conclusion;- Annonymous?? What?? <p>References</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Several references are missing	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Improve bibliographic references; Check writing and grammatical scores; Improve discussion; Provide missing data.	