

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Food Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AFSJ_102914
Title of the Manuscript:	Bio-ethanol production from Strawberry by Saccharomyces cerevisiae in repeated batch
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.journalafsj.com/index.php/AFSJ/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. May be important for science community , if the author well present better this.</p> <p>2. I'm not sure that, the author will use strawberry or raspberry. Because sound in the paper concentrate on raspberry more than strawberry.</p> <p>3. The abstract was not show about the reason and the important of this work, it generally describe on the work but not show the new idea that why they do the research.</p> <p>4. Manuscript are good but lack of conclusion in the job.</p> <p>5. Not sure, since the author should showed the graph or experimental data in this paper. They said only descriptive result.</p> <p>6. Refences were also good.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. Good</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The author should add the experimental data from the experiment and wrote the important point of the work in the field related to bioethanol.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Pornpimol Muangthai
Department, University & Country	Srinakharinwirot University, Thailand