SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJEE_30156**
Title of the Manuscript:	**ENZYMATIC CONVERSION OF WASTE (RICE HUSK) INTO FERMENTABLE SUGAR THROUGH DILUTED ACID PRETREATMENT**
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		
Minor REVISION comments	**Abstract:** Few typographical errors are noted: 1) See line 9, prefer "pH of 4.5" to "pH 4.5". 2) See line 12, correct 'yield' to 'yielded' in two usage. 3) See line 14, prefer "significantly reduced with increase with time" . 4) See line 15, prefer "increase at 4 hours". **Introduction:** 1) See page 2, line 42, prefer "great environmental threat". 2) See page 3, lines 52 - 53, this is a repetition of lines 42 and 43 please delete. 3) See page 3, lines 61 -63, the expression is speculative and cannot be established. Please delete. **Materials and Methods** 1) See page 4, line 69, the heading 2.2 to read "Sample Collection: Four hundred grams". 2) See page 4, line 82, prefer to read "After two hours". 3) See lines 87 & 97, text reference to read "described by Fang et al.,[25]"; and ". . .according to the protocol of Miller [26], as modified by Anamaria et al.,[27]. . .". 4) See line 91, prefer to read ". . . each in a combined volume of 100ml . . .". **Result and Discussion** 1) See line 99, prefer to read ". . . presented in Figures 1 and 2 . . .". 2) See line 100, prefer to read ". . . In this study, sulphuric acid was used . . .". 3) See line 104, prefer to read ". . . glucose significantly	

SDI Review Form 1.6

	reduced with . . . “. 4) See line 105, prefer to read “. . . which significantly increased at 4 hours . . . “. 5) See page 6, Figure 1, the key does not highlight one of the plots. There are 3No. plots not 2No. 6) See line 117, prefer to read “. . . Rice husk contains sugar . . . “. 7) See line 129, prefer to read “the sugar may be reduced . . .”. 8) See line 130, prefer to read “enzyme hydrolysis, because the acid has . . . “. 9) See line 132, prefer to read “greater dissolution of sugar . . .”. 10) See line 136, prefer to read “ability to promote hydrolysis . . .”. **Conclusion:** 1) See line 140, prefer to read “The results showed that . . .”. 2) See line 144, prefer to read “. . . Higher concentration may attract more . . .”. 3) See line 145, prefer to read “. . . formation of other degradation products which affect . . .”.	
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Ify L. Nwaogazie**
Department, University & Country	***Civil, Envt’l Engrg, University of Port Harcourt, Nigeria***