

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_110176
Title of the Manuscript:	SELECTION OF STARTER FROM DECAYING ORANGES AND PINEAPPLE FOR BIOETHANOL PRODUCTION
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes, this manuscript explores an important topic - using agricultural wastes like decaying fruits to produce bioethanol. This aligns with broader goals to develop renewable biofuels and reduce environmental waste. The isolation and selection of optimized yeast strains for industrial ethanol production has practical implications.</p> <p>2. The title of the manuscript should be corrected. <i>“Isolating and Characterizing Ethanol-Tolerant Yeast from Decaying Oranges and Pineapple for Bioethanol Production”</i></p> <p>3. The manuscript abstract is well-written.</p> <p>4. Yes, the manuscript covers all key aspects and is well organized into logical sections (introduction, methods, results, discussion). The only recommendation would be to add a Conclusions section to summarize the key outcomes.</p> <p>5. Yes, the science presented in the manuscript is sound and the experiments are appropriately designed to select starter cultures. The data analysis and interpretation also seem scientifically valid.</p> <p>6. Yes, the 30+ references cited seem sufficient and include research from the past 15 years. The key background literature is covered. No additional references are needed.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. It is better to check the manuscript by a native editor for editorial and grammatical errors.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Strengths: The paper has several strengths. Firstly, it provides a comprehensive overview of the research process, from selecting a study location to measuring osmotic tolerance. Secondly, the authors employed a variety of techniques to measure ethanol tolerance, such as inoculating 5 mL of sterile basal medium and 1 ml of the different carbon source with 0.1 mL of yeast cells. Thirdly, they used YEPD broth to measure proximate composition in orange and pineapple juice while preparing for ethanol production. Finally, they evaluated the sensitivity of the isolates to chloramphenicol and nalidixic acid by growing them in MEA in the presence of 30 g/ml discs.</p> <p>Weaknesses: The paper has several weaknesses. Firstly, it does not provide any information about the potential environmental impacts of ethanol production from decaying oranges and pineapple. Secondly, the authors did not discuss the potential economic implications of their findings. Thirdly, the paper does not provide any information on the safety and efficacy of their methods. Finally, the authors did not provide any information on how their findings could be applied to other research areas.</p>	

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mohammad Mahdi Soori
Department, University & Country	Kerman University of Medical Sciences, Iran