



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Microbiology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_50308
Title of the Manuscript:	Optimization for oxalic acid production by <i>Aspergillus niger</i> using Response Surface Methodology
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The authors have attempted for optimization for oxalic acid production by <i>Aspergillus niger</i> using response surface methodology. Though the authors used algal biomass for oxalic acid production, the novelty in the paper is lacking. The paper requires major revision.</li> <li>2. The logical presentation is poor. The author has to rewrite the paper especially the results and discussion.</li> <li>3. The unit of parameter has to mention uniformly throughout the paper. Eg. °C.</li> <li>4. The chemical formula should be written clearly.</li> <li>5. In introduction part, the author has mentioned fermentation of carbohydrates as synthetic method. To make it clear, the authors itself attempted fermentation method to produce oxalic acid using <i>A. niger</i> in this article.</li> <li>6. In materials and methods, the mention about algal biomass medium not clear. The authors have to mention clearly about the process of production of algal biomass medium.</li> <li>7. In sucrose medium, sucrose is missing in the composition</li> <li>8. The determination of oxalic acid production is not clear. The author has to mention in detail.</li> <li>9. Table 2, Give the equation in horizontal format.</li> <li>10. The Results and Discussion part is continuous and there should not be separate discussion.</li> <li>11. The results and discussion is poorly written and also written very short. The results are not given in coherent order and the results are poorly discussed with the published work. It should be in detail.</li> <li>12. The authors can give the relevant work in the Discussion part than giving more in Introduction part.</li> <li>13. Don't write pH 6.838 instead write pH 6.8</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The article has many grammar mistakes and it is difficult to mention each line. Hence, the authors are requested to consult an English expert in this regard to rectify the grammatical mistakes.</li> <li>2. Always give scientific name in italics or underlined.</li> </ol>	
<b>Optional/General</b> 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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<i>V. Mageshwaran</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>ICAR-Central Institute for Research on Cotton Technology, India</i>