SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biotechnology and Bioresource Technology
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJB2T_46079**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Biosynthesis of Lovastatin, an anti-cholesterol drug by Aspergillus wentii NCIM 661 from Palm kernel cake via Solid-state fermentation**
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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	**Although this manuscript is simple, it may be the first paper reporting palm kernel cake for lovastatin production using *Aspergillus wentii*. This manuscript is valuable for industry and also written well. Only few minor suggestions as shown in Minor REVISION comments.**	Yes, this is the first paper reporting palm kernel cake as a substrate for lovastatin production via SSF. This is a unique paper in utilising the available Bio resources for effective solid waste management. I agree with the reviewer for suggesting the minor REVISION comments.
Minor REVISION comments	1. Line 40 and line 41, revise "Aspergillus wentii" to revise "*A. wentii*" 2. Line 53, suggest to show the whole name of "NCIM" 3. Line 55, revise to italic form of "A. wentii"	As per the instructions given by reviewer, All these comments were corrected and highlighted in yellow colour for easy recognition of corrections in the peer reviewed manuscript.
Optional/General comments		Nothing from my side. I am thankful to reviewer for his valuable feedback.

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 such issues in this manuscript. Everyone worked collaboratively for this manuscript.