

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Biochemistry Research &amp; Review</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJBCRR_104027</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>A review on nutritional and medicinal value of dragon fruit (Hylocereus polyrizus Weber.)</b>
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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p><b>Yes. It will enable get medicinal value attached to the plant if well utilised.</b></p> <p><b>No. A review on Physiochemical and nutritional analysis of dragon fruit (Hylocereus polyrhizus (F.A.C.Weber) Britton &amp; Rose) cultivated in ( <b>State the Country</b>)</b></p> <p><b>No. No introduction has been given. Author should have highlighted the aim, state methodology and then come up with results and conclusion; summary form.</b></p> <p><b>No. The MS has not been clearly given subsections and described in each appropriately.</b></p> <p><b>No</b></p> <p><b>No. Referencing has been done wrongly and not to the Journals Format and standard.</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	No	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	A comprehensive revision is required and has a lot of grammatical English errors.	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Yuvenalis Morara Mbuni</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>National Museums of Kenya, Kenya</b>