

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JERR_102119</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Determination of Optimum Reaction Velocity for Glucose Production from Cassava Starch Using Gluco Amylase Sourced from Rice.</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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.journaljerr.com/index.php/JERR/editorial-policy> )

## 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>The subject of research is important.</p> <p>The title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>The abstract of the article is comprehensive.</p> <p>The references are sufficient having few recent publications.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>There are so many grammatical errors and incorrect sentences in the manuscript. The English writing should be carefully checked and improved by eliminating errors. The writing should be smooth and clearly understandable.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please merge sub-section 2.1 and 2.2.</li> <li>ii. Author mentioned "powered rice malt" in 2.3. Whether it is powered rice malt or powdered rice malt?</li> <li>iii. The materials and methods (Section 2) must be clearly written.</li> <li>iv. Why did you use six concentrations of standard glucose (D) solution to prepare standard curve?</li> <li>v. In section 2.5 it is mentioned that the substrate (cassava starch) was prepared in 0.5, 1.0, 1.5, 2.0, 2.5 and 3.0% [w/v] concentrations. What is other material that used for remaining portion? Please clearly write the procedure of substrate preparation.</li> <li>vi. What is the basis of evaluating reaction velocity?</li> <li>vii. Standard glucose calibration curve should not be under results and discussions section (3.1).</li> <li>viii. The Standard glucose calibration curve is not correct. It should be straight line variation. What is the web length of measuring optical density of different concentration of glucose in spectrophotometer?</li> <li>ix. What does mean by the sentence "The amount of glucose increased started increasing rapidly until 10 mins" (section 3.2)?</li> <li>x. Author claimed that "a gradual increase in glucose concentration from 10 minutes to 50 minutes reaction time was observed. Beyond this period, there was a decrease in glucose concentration.". However, practically is not correct for all cases. The glucose production was almost stopped after 20 minutes of hydrolysis for S2.0, S2.5 and S3.0 where highest production is about 0.25 g/l. It is observed that the rate of hydrolysis is slower in case of</li> </ol>	

## Review Form 1.7

	<p>lower concentration of substrate (S0.5, S1.0 and S1.5). Please explain the reason behind this phenomenon.</p> <p>xi. The glucose production is not significantly higher from higher concentration of substrate. Why did you advocating for S2.5 and S3.0?</p> <p>xii. The highest production was obtained after 20 minutes of hydrolysis for S2.0, S2.5 and S3.0 according to Figure 2. Why do you want to continue reaction for 40 and 50 minutes?</p> <p>xiii. The author did not provide any discussion on the obtained results in the manuscript. It should be elaborately discussed in depth.</p>	
--	---	--

### **PART 2:**

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

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Niamul Bari</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Rajshahi University of Engineering &amp; Technology, Bangladesh</b>