

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Food Research and Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFRN_97723
Title of the Manuscript:	Oxidative Stress markers and Toxic metals assessment in Albino Wistar rat fed with Vigna unguiculata expose to biopesticides (Bacillus thuringiensis, Neem Azadirachta) and agrochemical
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://journalajfrn.com/index.php/AJFRN/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		
1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)	Yes	
2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	Yes	
4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?	Yes	
6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Add minimum five references in the recent five years (2018-23)	
Minor REVISION comments	yes	
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	Overall, this is a clear, concise, and well-written manuscript. The introduction is relevant and theory based. Sufficient information about the previous study findings is presented for readers to follow the present study rationale and procedures. The methods are generally appropriate. The results are clear. Overall, this is a high quality manuscript.	

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:	E. Akila
Department, University & Country	Sri Sarada College for Women, India