

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_97388
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of dry fasting effect during Ramadan on protein glycation in Saudi individuals
Type of the 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://journalijbcr.com/index.php/IJBCRR/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>this manuscript evaluate the dry fasting effect during Ramadan on protein glycation in Saudi individuals. the topic is good, but this manuscript lacks good writing. The manuscript must be fundamentally modified according to the following Comments:</p> <p>1. The introduction section needs more literature survey for better literature review.</p> <p>2. There are so many grammar and spelling mistakes in the whole manuscript, please correct them.</p> <p>4. The conclusion in general of the analysis should be improved. They have made little use of the results obtained to improve conclusions.</p> <p>5. Highlight the novelty of your work. Because, there are a number of reports already available on this topic.</p> <p>6. in the discussion section reference this articles:</p> <p>1. Shokrzadeh, M., Bagheri, A., Ghassemi-Barghi, N. et al. Doxorubicin and doxorubicin-loaded nanoliposome induce senescence by enhancing oxidative stress, hepatotoxicity, and in vivo genotoxicity in male Wistar rats. Naunyn-Schmiedeberg's Arch Pharmacol 394, 1803–1813 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1007/s00210-021-02119-w https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s00210-021-02119-w</p> <p>2. Ahadi H, Shokrzadeh M, Hosseini-khah Z, Ghassemi barghi N, Ghasemian M, Emadi E, et al. Synthesis and biological assessment of ciprofloxacin-derived 1,3,4-thiadiazoles as anticancer agents. Bioorganic Chemistry. 2020;105:104383. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0045206820316813</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nasrin Ghassemi Barghi
Department, University & Country	Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Iran