Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JMSRR_96691**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Suitability of Bioethanol Production from Groundnut Shells using Saccharomyces cerevisae**
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://journaljmsrr.com/index.php/JMSRR/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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments **1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?** (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) **2. Is the title of the article suitable?** (If not please suggest an alternative title) **3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?** **4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** **5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?** **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)**	1. The issue addressed is very relevant because the production of waste from groundnuts is very important and solutions must be found to recover them. However, the topic is widely studied. There are a multitude of references on this subject. Also, the work carried out has many shortcomings in terms of rigor and precision. - Indeed, the biomass used has not been characterized for the cellulose content and the content (67%) indicated in the text does not correspond to the reference given. - Generally, a pre-treatment of the lignocellulosic biomass is carried out to make the cellulose available. This pre-treatment was not performed in this work. - The glucose content of the hydrolysate obtained after the acid hydrolysis is not known. Therefore, it is not possible to determine the conversion of glucose into ethanol. - The number of trials per experiment was two. This is not enough to correctly express the result and to trust it. All results should be expressed as mean ± standard deviation. 2. Yes 3. Yes 4. Yes 5. Partially 6. References are incomplete in terms of authors, document names, pagination, etc. They are not harmonized with each other. 3.94% of ethanol were recovered from 100 g of groundnut shells 7. The SI symbols are not always well written. 8. Graphs lack axis titles. The titles of the graphs must also be well formulated. 9. The scientific name of the yeast is incorrect *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* instead of *Saccharomyces cerevisae* 10. Chemical formula of ammonium sulphite is wrong. 11. The drying temperature, the drying time, as well as the final water content of groundnut shells are not known. 12. In this experiment, the fermentation time was 72 hours but the results are also given for 96 and 120 hours. It's ambiguous. 13. The results obtained have not been compared with existing data. For example, Adejumobi, Iyabode Bright and Ogunsuyi, Helen Olayinka* from Federal University of Technology (Akure, Nigeria) obtained 3.94% of ethanol from 100 g of groundnut shells compared to 27.5 % recovered in the present experiment * Adejumobi, Iyabode Bright and Ogunsuyi, Helen Olayinka, 2020. Production of bioethanol from groundnut (*Arachis hypogeae* l.) peels and shells. International Journal of Engineering Applied Sciences and Technology, Vol. 4, Issue 11, Pages 38-44.	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	Scientific English should be improved	
Optional/General comments		

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Svitlana Leonidovna Nitiema Yefanova**
Department, University & Country	**Institute of Sciences and Technologies, Burkina Faso**