

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Biotechnology and Bioresource Technology |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJB2T_112038 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Comparative study on ethanol Production from sweet potato flour and sugarcane juice using thermotolerant Kluyveromyces marxianus |
| Type of the Article | Original Research Article |

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>Yes, this manuscript is important, because it highlights the importance of renewable energy as the fastest growing energy source that is environmentally friendly. The demand for ethanol is increasing, and the main challenges for bioethanol production are cost and substrate availability.</p> <p>Yes, appropriate</p> <p>The abstract of the article is incomplete. The method needs to be clarified further in the abstract and there is no conclusion</p> <p>still not perfect, where the conclusion section does not explain in detail the results and discussion, with the values obtained. And after the image, please provide comments related to the image, and in the discussion section we have not linked the result data to academic reasons</p> <p>It is necessary to add a theoretical basis for obtaining these results, At the end of the discussion, limitations and shortcomings of the research should be given.</p> <p>Many people still use references that are outdated, it's best to use references less than 5 years old. And include DOI for each reference.</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | <p>Grammarly needs to be improved, there are still many ambiguous sentences.</p> | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | <p>The article needs to be revised in terms of content and language and the scientific reasons are not sharp enough.</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: | Sugeng Hadi Susilo |
| Department, University & Country | State Polytechnic of Malang, Indonesia |