

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_107835
Title of the Manuscript:	Potential Applications Of Spent Brewer's Yeast, A Residual By-Product Of Beer Production In Ivorian Breweries, Through The Identification Of Biochemical Characteristics
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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>This is very interesting comprehensive research and would serve as a baseline for further studies on the proximate composition and by-product recovery of the industrial food technology. I would highly appreciate the attempt of the authors, in the expansion of the scientific knowledge of the community - in food by-product recovery approaches.</p> <p>I made a correction in the title (mentioned in the manuscript, itself). Usually, a research article title should be short and eye-catching; So that readers are attracted to read the manuscript. So, try to make the title shorter.</p> <p>Yes, it meets the standards...However, I mentioned some suggestions, according to my point of view. Especially choose the keywords appearing in the abstract.</p> <p>Yes, well satisfactory</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>I recommend adding more updated references from the past 5 years -2018-2023 (if possible), rather than using too far references.</p> <p>During my reviewing process, I found a few points to be changed for a better outcome. Especially in the MATERIAL AND METHOD section authors have to write it more scientifically rather than just reporting what they have done. So, I included them as comments and some of the places I marked them in the manuscript itself. According to my point of view, If authors could make the changes accordingly, a better version of this manuscript would be resulted. The RESULTS AND DISCUSSION section was superb and well written after tallying with the previously published data. I wish them all the best and good luck.....</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Satisfactory, did minor corrections in some places (mentioned in the manuscript, itself).</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>-----</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	T.W.N.K. Perera
Department, University & Country	University of Kelaniya, Sri Lanka