



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Advances in Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AIR_21988</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>FAST SCREENING METHOD FOR LYSINE-PRODUCING YEASTS</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>Overall Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poor English. This may cause misinterepretation of manuscript content by reader in which the authors try to deliver.</li> <li>• Poor English. Grammatical and typo error are found.</li> <li>• The manuscript are poorly written and little or no discussion at all for the result obtained</li> <li>• Details and specific comments--- Refer manuscript</li> </ul> <p><b>Title</b> Suggestion: <b>FAST SCREENING METHOD FOR DETERMINE</b> LYSINE-PRODUCING YEASTS</p> <p><b>Abstract</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some important findings are not included in the abstract</li> <li>• Not concise enough</li> </ul> <p><b>Keywords:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appropriate</li> </ul> <p><b>Introduction</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acceptable</li> </ul> <p><b>Material and Methods</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No statistical analysis</li> <li>• Some methods are unclear and more elaboration is required.</li> <li>• Not sufficiently explained</li> </ul> <p><b>Results and Discussions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Lack of interpreted and related to existing knowledge on the topic</li> </ul>	



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Anonymous</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universiti Sains Malaysia , Malaysia</b>