



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>)

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		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> As you mentioned "fast screening method", do you have compared with any others? It seems not so proper that only one sentence for the conclusion. 	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Chen-Chin Chang
Department, University & Country	Department of Food and Beverage Management, University of Kang Ning, Taiwan