

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Biochemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRB_97189
Title of the Manuscript:	With a new method measurement of Zn, Cu, Cu/Zn levels in third-trimester pregnant women
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>)

Review Form 1.7

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>ORIGINALITY: (*).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does the paper clearly point out differences from related research? Yes - Are the problems or approaches new? yes <p>For example, does the paper: address a new problem or one that has not been studied in much depth? yes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> introduce an interesting research paradigm? yes introduce an area that appears promising, or might stimulate others to develop promising alternatives? yes <p>SIGNIFICANCE (*).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is the work important? yes - Does it advance the state of the art? yes - Does the paper stimulate discussion of important issues or alternative points of view? yes <p>TECHNICAL QUALITY (*).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is the paper technically sound, with compelling arguments? - Is there a careful evaluation? Does the paper carefully evaluate the strengths and limitations of its contributions? yes - Does the paper offer a new form of evidence in support of or against a well known technique? - If the paper describes an application, is there: a clear and compelling motivation for why the chosen approach is important? a careful description of the design and implementation of the system? a thorough evaluation of the system with respect to a clearly-stated set of functional and quality requirements? yes <p>QUALITY OF PRESENTATION (*).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is the paper clearly written? yes - Does the paper motivate the research? yes - Are results clearly described and evaluated? yes - Is the paper well organized? yes 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>This paper proposes the With a new method measurement of Zn, Cu, Cu/Zn levels in third-trimester pregnant women</p> <p>I have some recommendations and remarks:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- What interests your work, 2- Try to show more experiences results for each topic 3- Use and study other recent methods. 4. you should include the section references. 5. The paper needs revisions; the second round of major revisions is needed, both concerning the structure and content of the paper. 6. The approach section (which describes the approach) is very brief, the work of the authors should be well detailed and clearly presented. 7. if it is possible to add a section where you cite related works and give background information 8. Authors must discuss obtained results and compare them with results obtained in related works 	

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Yusef Farhaoui
Department, University & Country	Moulay Ismail University, Morocco