

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_93394
Title of the Manuscript:	QUALITY EVALUATION OF EGGS FROM ISA BROWN AS INFLUENCED BY NATURAL ANTIOXIDANTS AND STORAGE TIME
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:

(<https://www.journalarrb.com/index.php/ARRB/editorial-policy>)

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	<p>It is a good work in which research stands out, however the following recommendations are made: Generally non-standard abbreviations should not be used, if necessary they should be clearly defined in the abstract, at first use. It is recommended to check that the introduction section is coherent and has order in the wording, assessing what is intended to be of interest to the reader</p> <p>It is recommended to take care of the writing style (notes are made on the document so that they can be considered by the authors). It is important to follow the citation guidelines - placing references according to the indications of the journal, both in the text (paragraphs), and at the end of the list of references (in this section there is variability in the writing of references - review and correct)</p> <p>References must be listed at the end of the manuscript and numbered in the order that they appear in the text. Every reference referred in the text must also present in the reference list and vice versa. In the text, citations should be indicated by the reference number in brackets [3].</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Suggestions are not necessary.</p> <p>Reference to a journal:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Hilly M, Adams ML, Nelson SC. A study of digit fusion in the mouse embryo. Clin Exp Allergy. 2002;32(4):489-98. <p>Reference to a book:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Rang HP, Dale MM, Ritter JM, Moore PK. Pharmacology. 5th ed. Edinburgh: Churchill Livingstone; 2003. <p>Reference to Web-resource or Electronic articles.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Hugo JT, Mondal SC. Parallels between tissue repair and embryo morphogenesis: a conceptual framework. Global Health. 2006;16:4. Accessed 29 March 2012. Available: http://www.globalizationandhealth.com/content/1/1/14. 	
Optional/General comments	<p>It is important to consider the guidelines of writing - editing that gives the journal, and as an example the following conditions can be applied at work This predominance of <i>A. lumbricoides</i> than any other GIPs agreed with some other reports [23,15]. On the other hand, da Silva et al. [19], Khanal et al. [2] and Hernández et al. [25] found <i>T. trichiura</i> predominant</p>	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Benjamin Valladares Carranza
Department, University & Country	Autonomous University of the State of Mexico, México