

# Review of: "Techno-Economic Fermentative Microbe-Based Industrial Production of Lactic Acid (LA): Potential Future Prospects and Constraints"

Ahmed Halilu<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Universiti Malaya

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The manuscript can be accepted after addressing the following comments and concerns:

- 1- All the Figures are blurry. They should be modified for better clarity.
- 2- Authors claimed they conducted formal analysis but the manuscript is a descriptive review. For instance; "The current analysis highlights biochemical advances in commercializing lactic acid production using bagasse feedstock. This review identifies these limitations and discusses solutions for industrial lactic acid production. The study also explores pretreatment, saccharification, and fermentation techniques for industrial and lab-scale lactic acid production. This study encapsulates the sugarcane bagasse-derived lactic acid processing, highlighting the potential of 2G lactic acid in expanding sugar industries and bio-based fuel production." Therefore, authors should properly address this concern by modifying the abstract and the conclusion section.
- 3- In Section 3; H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub>, C<sub>2</sub>H<sub>8</sub>N<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>3</sub>COOH, C<sub>2</sub>H<sub>5</sub>NO are wrongly written. The numbers should be subscripted. The same applies in section 6.3. Authors should correct the oversights.
- 4- The title of the manuscript does not suitably capture the content of the manuscript. Authors should update the title to capture the content of the manuscript. A technoeconomic analysis is more in-depth than what is provided in the manuscript.
- 5- Authors should mention the content of the table in the text.
- 6- The type of enzyme where necessary should be clearly mentioned quantitatively.
- 7- The title, abstract and the content of the manuscript must be in harmony to reflect clear objective of the manuscript.