

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Biochemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRB_97006
Title of the Manuscript:	CELLULOLYTIC FUNGI FROM PALM PRESSED FIBER, EMPTY FRUIT BUNCH, AND PALM TRUCK
Type of the 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://journalajrb.com/index.php/AJRB/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	<p>Reviewer's comment The abstract does not specify the objective of this research</p> <p>Improve the wording of the text</p> <p>Incorrect scientific spelling in scientific names.</p> <p>Missing units on the axes of the graphs</p> <p>There is no consistency between those exposed in the text and Figure 2.</p> <p>Review the description of Figure 1 in the text In day 5, organism C showed the highest zone of clearance, 11.5mm while organism D all showed the lowest clearance zone of 1.6mm but not larger from organism E. Include the explanation of the deviations in Figure 2, to assess the difference in weight of the mycelia between the days. Review the conclusion for the days of greatest production The number of repetitions of the test is not specified, to then speak of the deviations in Figure 2.</p>	<p>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>
<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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. It is important for a potential use of the biomass of the palm.</p> <p>2. Yes</p> <p>3. No, it lacks the objective</p> <p>4. No, the experimental design is missing</p> <p>5. No, it lacks experimental replicates</p> <p>6. Yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Revise wording</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>It is suggested to carry out a statistical analysis</p>	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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>
<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>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Catalina Machuca Rodríguez</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>National Autonomous University of Mexico, Mexico</p>