

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Biotechnology Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJI_104302
Title of the Manuscript:	OPTIMIZATION OF BIOETHANOL PRODUCTION FROM SUGARCANE BAGASSE USING IMPROVED STRAINS OF <i>Saccharomyces cerevisiae</i>
Type of the Article	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.journalbji.com/index.php/BJI/editorial-policy>)

There is novelty in the work

Review Form 1.7

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>It is essential for scientific communities exploring the potential of bioethanol complementing and or replacing the current use of fossil fuels with the evaluation of an improved enzyme for yield improvement.</p> <p>Evaluation of <i>Saccharomyces cerevisiae</i> Improved Strains Potential in the Bioethanol Production from Sugarcane Bagasse</p> <p>There is need for a minor issue to be addressed</p> <p>Yes, except for the third section where results were presented separately, which would be have better presented together. That is, present results and discussed it, instead of doing so separately.</p> <p>Satisfactory but some other issues need to be addressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● No sufficient justification for the reserarch gap ● The need for further studies to look into kinetic studies can be included in the recommendations <p>There is also need for the author to review some recent paper. In present form, bulk of the paper referenced are not recents. So, there is need to further review recent literature to justify the research gap filled by the report and to further establish the existing report on the economic viabilities of employing the use of biomass for bioethanol production.</p> <p>The author could possibly look into reviewing economic viability study reports like https://doi.org/10.29081/jesr.v26i3.219, https://doi.org/10.22044/rera.2020.10288.1043, and the likes.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>There is need for the author do a general grammatical check and spelling error to address some typographical errors.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Toyese Oyegoke
Department, University & Country	Ahmadu Bello University, Nigeria