

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Biochemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRB_101632
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF THE PHYTOCHEMICAL CONSTITUENTS AND ANTIOXIDANT PROPERTIES OF OILS FROM DURA AND TENERA VARIETIES OF <i>Elaeis guineensis</i> FRUITS
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://journalajrb.com/index.php/AJRB/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><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>1. <b>Yes, the manuscript is important for scientific community</b></p> <p>2. <b>Yes, the title of the article is suitable.</b></p> <p>3. <b>Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive.</b></p> <p>4. <b>Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</b></p> <p>5. <b>The manuscript is scientifically correct.</b></p> <p>6. <b>Yes, the references are sufficient and recent. Review the line spacing in the references section; some have single spacing, others double.</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>	<p>1. <b>No, the quality of the language is not adequate, it needs further revision.</b></p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>1. <b>In the methodology, the equipment or materials must indicate the registered trademark TM or ® as appropriate.</b></p> <p>2. <b>Review I found several words together and blank space.</b></p> <p>3. <b>In the methodology, homogenize the format, for example, ml in some parts is as ml, as cm 3. or as mL. review.</b></p> <p>4. <b>The conclusion looks like a kind of general discussion; this should be clear and concise.</b></p>	

**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>Ma. del Carmen Chávez Parga</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universidad Michoacana de San Nicolás de Hidalgo, México</b>