

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_119136
Title of the Manuscript:	Sodium Dodecyl Sulphate-Polyacrylamide Gel Electrophoresis (SDS-PAGE) Characterization of protein fractions in ten peanut bunch type varieties
Type of the Article	

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. This manuscript is about the use of SDS-PAGE method to characterize the protein fractions of ten peanut bunch type varieties. Although in general the SDS-PAGE method is relatively simple, the authors have used it appropriately in combination with other methods resulting in a manuscript with important preliminary information on the protein profile of peanut seeds for variety identification among the seeds.</p> <p>2. The article is suitable to publish</p> <p>3. The abstract is comprehensive enough to summarize the aims, methods and the results of the experiments.</p> <p>4. Subsections and structure of the manuscript were written appropriately</p> <p>5. In general, the manuscript is scientifically correct</p> <p>6. The references are sufficient and recent</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Some minor corrections need to be made:</p> <p>1. There are some typos and inconsistencies in writing. E.g. in subsection 3, inconsistencies in the use of letters at the beginning of words: table, figure. Similar inconsistencies are also found on other pages/subsections.</p> <p>2. Inconsistencies in how to write source citations. Some include names, some use numbering (see the introduction).</p> <p>3. There are abbreviations that are not common and have no explanation. E.g. "SDS-ME" (subsection 3), "Sr.no." (in Table 1)</p> <p>4. The authors should include the relative molecular weight (Mr or M) i.e. in kDa, for each standard used in the images of the SDS-PAGE results.</p> <p>5. There is a lack of clarity regarding the discussion in "3.1.2. Globulin". The author discusses according to the PAGE analysis of Figure 6, while Figure 6 is the SDS-PAGE result. Please let the authors clarify this.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	As mentioned above	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sulaiman N Depamede
Department, University & Country	University of Mataram, Indonesia