

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_107521
Title of the Manuscript:	Antioxidative potentials of Annona muricata pulp and Allium cepa bulb juices
Type of the Article	

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>1.yes 2.yes 3. yes 4. yes 5. no 6. yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Dear Authors,</p> <p>Congratulations on your study. I think the study is Original.</p> <p>I have some suggestions to make.</p> <p>Summary: the methodology lacks a description of the statistical analysis used</p> <p>Work as a whole:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The authors highlight that the type of study is quasi-experimental. However, quasi-experimental studies are generally done through epidemiological research, not basic research. - Authors should review the type of method study, as I consider it an experimental study, but without intervention. - I think the authors should provide more detail in the subsections of the methodology as they lack information on how the experiments took place. It is important to cite the references of the method used, but it is necessary to describe how it was done in detail for reproducibility purposes. - The statistical analysis is without detail and deserves further detail. <p>In general, I think the study can be improved, I leave some references to guide you.</p> <p>Cheng H, Huang G. Extraction, characterization and antioxidant activity of Allium sativum polysaccharide. Int J Biol Macromol. 2018 Jul 15;114:415-419. doi: 10.1016/j.ijbiomac.2018.03.156. Epub 2018, March 27th. PMID: 29596932.</p> <p>Tsvetkova D, Obreshkova D, Zheleva-Dimitrova D, Saso L. Antioxidant activity of galantamine and some of its derivatives. Curr Med Chem. 2013;20(36):4595-608. doi: 10.2174/09298673113209990148. PMID: 23834167.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	Masood S, Rehman AU, Ihsan MA, Shahzad K, Sabir M, Alam S, Ahmed W, Shah ZH, Alghabari F, Mehmood A, Chung G. Antioxidant potential and α -glucosidase inhibitory activity of onion peel (<i>Allium cepa</i> L.) and bulb extracts. Braz J Biol. 2021 Oct 11;83:00264. doi: 10.1590/1519-6984.247168. PMID: 34669793.	
--	---	--

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Karen Cordovil
Department, University & Country	Oswaldo Cruz Foundation, Brazil