**SDI Review Form 1.6**

| | |
|---|---|
| Journal Name: | **Archives of Current Research International** |
| Manuscript Number: | **Ms_ACRI_57776** |
| Title of the Manuscript: | **Biotechnology and Sustainable Industralisation for National Development** |
| 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:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/editorial-policy )

**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 | **Relevant subject. Good bibliography. However, the text could be written in a more fluid style, there are too few paragraphs especially in the introduction section. Try to separate in more paragraphs to increase readability. I also noticed that you overused the citation to Tietyen et al, 2000 during the introduction. Try to diversify your sources.**<br>**There are some literal citations that fail to provide more details from the bibliography (such as the page where the original text comes from). There are texts that are literal copies from your sources, which might be considered plagiarism if you fail to cite them properly. Try to use your own words and mix sources to increase your impact.** | |
| **Minor** REVISION comments | Your citation style should be improved as to the journal's guidelines. There are some typos such as "industrialisation" and "urbanisation" that an automated orthographic review might solve. | |
| **Optional/General** comments | The main declared objective of the paper is education. I would call this type of paper a "review", so this should be its first objective in my opinion. The text is a bit fuzzy and I felt that I wasn't being guided thought it by the author, maybe it would help to use numbers in your sections to differentiate sub chapters from chapters. | |

**SDI Review Form 1.6**

**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)* | |

**Reviewer Details:**

| | |
|---|---|
| Name: | **Leandro Rodrigues Gonçalves** |
| Department, University & Country | **Universidade de São Paulo, Brasil** |