

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Biochemistry</a>
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

#### PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>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.</b>	For the treatment of wound healing this manuscript is suitable for the community. I like this manuscript because the involvement of animal studies in this research. The technique used in this manuscript is less invasive.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	No, the title should be like Evaluation of wound healing activities of the two honeys AF and NZ found from the Southern regions of Senegal (Casamance)	
<b>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.</b>	No, Methodology of the abstract should contain the animal treatments. Result should be written in more scientific way.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	Whole manuscript should be justified and arranged according to journal author guidelines. Animal ethical approval number should be included in material and methods. Calculation table is missing in Result part. In result part the heading should be evaluation instead of evolution. In discussion part Aim is repeated as in abstract. Discussion part should be written in more scientific way.	
<b>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.</b>	Why standard drug sulfadiazine not produce wound healing property effectively as compared to honey, please explain. In this manuscript the comparison between two honeys are done, which explains their efficacy.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b> =	References are not according to journal guidelines and some are too old. Make it arranged according to standard vancouver style format.	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Grammatical errors are there. Paragraphs are not justified. References need to be arranged in standard format according to journal policy.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	In introduction part the description of two honeys should be there. Recent literature survey related on this study of this two honeys should be mentioned. The reason behind the study should be there in introduction part. Discussion should be written in more sophisticated way.	

### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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:	<b>Prabhat Kumar Das</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>GRY Institute of Pharmacy, India</b>