

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Biotechnology Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJI_98328
Title of the Manuscript:	Optimization of Spirulina's phycocyanin extraction yield using response surface method
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:

(<https://www.journalbjournal.com/index.php/BJI/editorial-policy>)

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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. Yes exactly, researcher want to enhancing the yield of phycocyanin production as a highly valuable compound from Spirulina biomass. Phycocyanin has strong antioxidant ability and widely utilized in various fields, ranging from food to pharmaceutical and cosmetic industry. Therefore, producing a large amount of good-quality PC at a reasonable price to meet the market demand is currently a big practical question for PC producers. 2. Yes, it is suitable 3. Yes, it is comprehensive 4. Yes, it is appropriate, but needs a little bit explanation 5. Yes, the method is correct as far as I know 6. It is sufficient	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, it is suitable	
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ishmah Hanifah
Department, University & Country	IPB University, Indonesia