

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Biochemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRB_121545
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation Of The Interactions Of Some Alkali And Alkali Earth Metallic Chlorides On Guaiacol Oxidation By Peroxidase From Watermelon Rind
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript investigates the interactions of alkali and alkali earth metallic chlorides on the guaiacol oxidation process mediated by peroxidase from watermelon rind. This research is significant as it explores alternative sources of peroxidase, which is crucial for industrial applications due to its biocatalytic properties. The study provides insights into the potential use of watermelon rind as a cost-effective source of peroxidase, which could have implications for biotechnological processes, including waste treatment and the synthesis of aromatic compounds.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title is suitable and clearly reflects the content and focus of the research. It highlights the key elements of the study: the interaction of metallic chlorides and the specific enzymatic reaction being investigated.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract is comprehensive, providing a clear overview of the aim, methodology, results, and conclusion of the study. However, it could be improved by including specific numerical results or findings to give a clearer snapshot of the study's outcomes. This would enhance the reader's understanding of the significance of the findings at a glance.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The manuscript is well-structured, with appropriate subsections that facilitate a logical flow of information. The subsections within the methodology and results are detailed and clearly described.</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The manuscript appears scientifically robust and technically sound. The experimental design is well-described, and the methodology is appropriate for the study's objectives. The results are presented with clarity and are supported by data, including figures and tables. The discussion effectively interprets the findings in the context of existing literature, providing a logical narrative of the study's contributions to the field.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>⋮</p>	<p>The references cited are relevant and sufficiently cover the background and context of the study. However, it would be beneficial to include more recent studies related to the application of peroxidases from alternative sources to strengthen the discussion on the relevance of the research.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language is suitable for scholarly communication, with clear and concise expression of ideas. There are minor grammatical errors and typographical errors that need correction for improved clarity and readability. Consider proofreading the manuscript to ensure linguistic precision.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The manuscript is well-executed and presents valuable findings relevant to the field of enzymology and biotechnology. Minor revisions to enhance the abstract's detail and correct language errors will strengthen the manuscript further.</p>	

Review Form 3

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:	V B Kasyapa Jannabhatla
Department, University & Country	Narayana Medical College and Hospital, India