



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_45541
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Studies on Synthetic and Agricultural Product on Lysine Production by Alcaligenes aquatilis
Type of the 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	It is a premature work; authors should take into account the following: 1) The INTRODUCTION is very poor and it should be improved appropriately, 2) There are information which are incorporated in the RESULTS AND DISCUSSION, instead in INTRODUCTION, 3) The section MATERIALS AND METHODS (subsections: <u>Comparative difference between Glucose and Banana</u> , and <u>Comparative difference between ammonium sulphate and soyabean</u>) should be enriched by relatively modern methods of comparison using reliable statistics. The criteria of comparisons should be also well defined. 4) Authors should thoroughly revise the section RESULTS AND DISCUSSION, which is a confusing text in its present form. 5) Authors should thoroughly revise and improve the whole text, which is not followed well, and thus it is confusing the reader.	Okay, I have done so
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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)	No