

Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Biotechnology and Bioresource Technology |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJB2T_82848 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Production of Cellulase and Amylase Enzymes in both Solid and Liquid States by Two Species of Fungi |
| 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://journalajb2t.com/index.php/AJB2T/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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) |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|
| <u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments | <p>The title is appropriate, clear, concise and informative of the content of the article.</p> <p>ABSTRACT: The abstract is clear but the objectives should be emphasized, the methodology should be better explained it is very general, the main results are mentioned but it is recommended to note some more relevant conclusions.</p> <p>INTRODUCTION:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) Careful spacing between words.2) The introduction clearly identifies the central issue or problem but does not adequately describe the objectives. <p>METHOD:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) In section 2.4 explain why these combinations of substrate concentrations were used.2) Pay attention to the symbology of numbers, degrees, formulas..., some of them are not correct.3) In point 2.5.2 it is mentioned "Then 0.5 g Carboxymethyl cellulose (CMC)..." but before this compound was mentioned with only the acronym correct this from the beginning.4) In section 2.5.2 explain why concentrations of 0.5, 1, 1.5 and 2 were chosen.5) It is suggested to mention if the methodologies of points 2.5.1. and 2.5.2. are of own creation or of another author.6) Paragraph 2.6.1 does not follow the same format.7) °C no OC.8) There are several acronyms that do not have a description and it is not known what they are.9) It is suggested to correct the positions of the bibliographic citations within the paragraphs in the text, I consider that they are wrongly placed in the paragraph, if they correspond to the text of the paragraph but they should go before or after within the paragraph not always at the end of the paragraph.10) Take care of the margins of the texts, they are not the same. <p>RESULTS AND DISCUSSION:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) What is ABIBM and AFPW? Mention from the methodology.2) In points 3.1. and 3.2. further discussion with other similar works is suggested. The comparisons are too few.3) Correct the presentation of figure 2A, the axis of abscissae is not understood.4) It is suggested to discuss further the results presented in figure 2, the discussion presented is very simple.5) Improve the presentation of figure 3.6) It is suggested to discuss further the results presented in figure 3, the discussion presented is very simple.7) Further discussion of the results is suggested. <p>CONCLUSION:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) why no conclusions?2) The quality and quantity of the data presented DOES NOT HAVE a logical proportion and relationship to the conclusions, BECAUSE THERE ARE | |

Review Form 1.6

| | | |
|----------------------------------|--|--|
| | NO CONCLUSIONS. REFERENCES: 1) References should be exactly as per the journal format, refer a recent article from the current issue. 2) It is suggested to have more updated bibliographic references. | |
| Minor REVISION comments | 1) Careful spacing between words and paragraphs. 2) The citations are complete and correspond to the bibliographic references. | |
| Optional/General comments | 1) The article is well written and organized. 2) The introduction shows a good content of the topic that places the reader in the interest of the study. 3) The length of the article is adequate and meets the criteria required by the publication. 4) Improve punctuation marks. | |

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? | There are no ethical problems in the manuscript. | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Name: | Carlos Hernan Herrera Mendez |
| Department, University & Country | Universidad De Guanajuato, Mexico |