



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_49462
Title of the Manuscript:	APPLICATION OF RESPONSE SURFACE METHODOLOGY IN OPTIMIZING BIOETHANOL PRODUCTION FROM CALABASH ( <i>Crescentia cujete</i> ) SUBSTRATE USING <i>Saccharomyces cerevisiae</i> .
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>)



**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>Page 2 line 6 reference should be separated with ;                      Line 14 and 20 the sentences must begin with Capital letters i.e The and It.                      Concise aim of the study should be provided at the end of introduction.                      Page 2 line 2 Saccharomyces cerevisiae should be italicized                      Line 8 concentrated at 50? – justify                      Line 21 page 3 cereviae should be changed to cerevisiae                      Page 11 line 2 Caption should be added as a key to specify meaning of a.u</p> <p>You should explained available information on the importance of your research as you describe little information in the introduction.</p> <p>Conclusion should be re-written</p> <p>Citations should followed author's guideline i.e indicated by reference number in the bracket.</p> <p>References should followed author's guidelines. i.e abbreviate the journal title</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Language should be checked before the submission</li> <li>- The results were not well explained and discussed. You should find scientific reasons to explain your findings.</li> <li>- RSM- reader can confused on this section as there was no any explanation about the findings.</li> <li>- In my impression, all calibrations curves should be moved to appendices as they reflect same information with the table</li> <li>-</li> </ul>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Improvement is need	

**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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b><i>Nafi'u Abdulkadir</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>Sokoto State University, Nigeria</i></b>