

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Biochemistry Research &amp; Review</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJBCRR_118836</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Cryoethanolic Extraction, Purification of Allicin from Allium sativum and HPTLC analysis</b>
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://journalijbcr.com/index.php/IJBCRR/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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>  <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	Yes  Yes  No yes  no	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	1. in the introduction, the HPLC technique must be described and an analysis of some studies carried out with the help of this technique 2. the results and discussions part lack citations from other studies  3. the conclusions and discussions must be very detailed	

### 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)
<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:	Luisa Andronie
Department, University & Country	University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine Cluj-Napoca, Romania