SCIENCEDOMAIN international

www.sciencedomain.org



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 <u>NO</u> manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '<u>lack of Novelty'</u>, 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)

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)

SCIENCEDOMAIN international www.sciencedomain.org



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	In my concern the subject discussed in the paper is suited for publication in Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports, however as short communication due to few results presented and also with major revision, mainly in English language. Detailed comments (only on the scientific content of the manuscript). In whole text, some words are repeated (that), write wrong (soyabean?) and avoid putting too much "of" and "the". Abstract Explain more, mainly, the objectives and the results obtained in the study. Explore more these informations in the abstract. Introduction Please, add some brief report about the commercial value of the compound and something about production processes. In the end of introduction add only the aim of the work and not results.	his/her feedback here)
	MATERIALS AND METHODS Microrganism section: How was microorganism isolated and identified? Add more details about these steps. Comparative studies sections: I suggest that these sections could be together. Explain better why basal medium composition used was different the first? How many UFC/mL were in two loopful? Describe in more detail that. Please, place the L-lysine detection methodology, the statistical analyses. Results, discussion and conclusion sections are very poor. Please improve these sections. Where are growth and L-lysine production curves?	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

		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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Viana, Daniela
Department, University & Country	University of Pernambuco, Brazil

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)