



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_21988
Title of the Manuscript:	FAST SCREENING METHOD FOR LYSINE-PRODUCING YEASTS
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Overall Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor English. This may cause misinterepretation of manuscript content by reader in which the authors try to deliver. • Poor English. Grammatical and typo error are found. • The manuscript are poorly written and little or no discussion at all for the result obtained • Details and specific comments--- Refer manuscript <p>Title Suggestion: FAST SCREENING METHOD FOR DETERMINE LYSINE-PRODUCING YEASTS</p> <p>Abstract</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some important findings are not included in the abstract • Not concise enough <p>Keywords:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate <p>Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acceptable <p>Material and Methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No statistical analysis • Some methods are unclear and more elaboration is required. • Not sufficiently explained 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I do not agree with the reviewer. The language is scientific and not just English language. • Typographical errors noted and have been corrected. • Details of specific comments have been corrected. <p>Title – good idea but I would prefer ‘Fast Screening Method for Detecting Lysine Producing Yeasts’.</p> <p>Abstract- I guess abstract is all about summary of the research.</p> <p>Materials and Methods- This is a preliminary work just to prove that yeasts are as good as bacteria in producing lysine.</p> <p>Results and Discussion- The detailed work will be published later. No previous work has been done.</p> <p>Conclusion- has been modified. No work has been done on this before.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Results and Discussions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">✓ Lack of interpreted and related to existing knowledge on the topic✓ Little or no discussion on the findings obtained✓ No interpreted and related to existing knowledge on the topic✓ The authors did compare their findings with previous researchers <p>Conclusions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The conclusions are NOT sound and justified <p>References/Bibliography</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Not really up to date. The authors may not get the latest/current research status about the field of interest.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		