

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Biochemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRB_125136
Title of the Manuscript:	Healing activity of two honeys from the Southern regions of Senegal (Casamance)
Type of the Article	Research article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory 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>
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.	The manuscript is very important for the management of wounds and burns, which are serious and disabling health problems. There is still no approved remedy that leads to quick and uncomplicated healing of burns and wounds. Recently, numerous studies have been conducted that highlighted the favorable medicinal properties of honey, but further research is still needed.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	More suitable would be the title WOUND HEALING ACTIVITY OF TWO HONEYS FROM... Because healing is too general, also possible inside the human body.	
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.	I suggest the addition of a short description of the term <i>score</i> , for example <i>Cicatrization process evaluation</i>	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes.	
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.	The exact score at a certain phase, as it is used in the manuscript, can be subjective and not very precise (the limits between 0, 1 and 2 scores). Instead, more accurate could be the reduction in burn wound size (area), over time. This can be assessed even with graph paper over the wound. The manuscript can increase its value by adding this parameter (burn wound size). Theoretically, the wound is initially a circle with 3 cm diameter, as it was produced. Sulfadiazine is not used as a reference product in clinical trials of first-degree burns. The reference 23 does not open. In Conclusion: This healing effect may be linked to the presence of the hydrogen peroxide methylglyoxal. Hydrogen peroxide <u>and</u> methylglyoxal are two different factors that together contribute to wound healing, but the manuscript did not study them.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Quite recent.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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:	Andrei Zbucea
Department, University & Country	District Emergency Hospital of Ploiesti, Romania