



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_36125
Title of the Manuscript:	Nutrient Enrichment of Agro–Industrial Waste Using Solid State Fermentation
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 <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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Introduction • Author should cite key information such as in line 10 • Revise statement starting from line 9 • Revise statement starting from line 15, 17, 19 • Paragraph 3, line 23 needs to be referenced • Paragraph 3, revise statement starting from line 24 • Revise last sentence of paragraph 3 • Paragraph 4, line 1 - sentence is incomplete • Paragraph 4, statements starting from line 6 -11; I think are not in their right positions. This could be added to the discussion part • The sentence describing the aim of the work should be restructured appropriately to depict what the article really means The author has provided some background information on the subject area, but I think it will seem more complete if the author had concentrated a little on the biochemical constituents of these agro industrial wastes and the organism being employed. Material and Methods • I think the subtopic “ characterization of wastes” is a little misleading, I would recommend “proximate analysis” or “chemical analysis” • Statement under characterization of wastes should be rephrased. I think it should be “according to the	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	method of AOAC" • Author should check punctuations on statements made under strain used • Author should be more specific; is the author attributing the sub culturing (grown) to the citations or the composition of the PDA. • Author should consider revision of sentence starting from line 3 under "inoculum preparation" • I think it is good to use "moistened" instead of "impregnated" Generally, I would say author has provided enough information for the easy reproducibility of this work. However, author should consider revision of the materials and methods noting critically the tenses and punctuations used. Results and Discussions • This is the point where the author is supposed to interpret his / results, as the heading implies, with this section it deals with showing results of the work and discussing the results by providing reasons for such observations (backed by literature) and comparing your work to that of others who have done a similar research. With regards to this, I encourage the author to properly present this section by first introducing the results followed by scientific reasons (discussions) to back the results (i.e. reasons for such observations and comparison with similar work). In this way the reader follows the logic of the work and will enjoy reading. • For instance during solid state fermentation, the microorganism involved produces some enzymes, talk about all of these. • The legend to the figures and table should be	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	revised. The legend should be brief and it should contain sufficient explanatory details to explain the figures or tables without the need to refer to the text. The author should revise the conclusion of the study. I believe framing the conclusion by sticking to the application and usefulness of the concluded objective / aim, would make the conclusion sound better. I recommend author to go through this manuscript and consider sentence structure, tenses and punctuations.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	• Author should revise the citation style in the text. Author uses the two names of the citations instead of just using the surname. • Author should be consistent with the referencing format at the list of references	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I congratulate the author (s) for such a good work. This is an economically important topic especially when alternative sources for feeding farm animals is considered. The employment of solid state fermentation technology (a very suitable technology for developing countries) for such process is very essential. This project will go a long way to reduce competition for food such as maize with farm animals.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Samuel Kwatia</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Department of Biochemistry and Biotechnology, Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Ghana</i>