

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Biochemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRB_128296
Title of the Manuscript:	Chemical Composition and Antioxidant Activity of Extracted Lipid from Pangasius Pangasius: A Complementary Analysis
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>

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript provides valuable insights into the chemical composition and antioxidant activity of lipids extracted from <i>Pangasius pangasius</i> , a widely consumed freshwater fish. The findings contribute to the understanding of its nutritional and functional properties, highlighting its potential as a source of bioactive compounds. This complementary analysis is significant for the scientific community, as it opens new avenues for the utilization of <i>Pangasius</i> lipids in health-promoting food products and nutraceuticals, while also emphasizing its role in advancing research on natural antioxidants and sustainable use of aquatic resources.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	I think it would be better changed to Profile of Lipid and Antioxidant Activity Lipids Extracted from Pangasius Pangasius: Complementary Analysis	
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.	<input type="checkbox"/> Clearly state the methods and their rationale in one concise sentence. <input type="checkbox"/> Summarize the major findings in relation to their relevance (e.g., potential applications in food science or health). <input type="checkbox"/> Add a concluding sentence emphasizing the implications or importance of the findings.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	<p>The manuscript seems to have some scientific elements, but there are several issues that need to be addressed for it to be considered scientifically robust.</p> <p>Recommendations for Improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Clearly define and explain the methodology, including sample preparation, extraction conditions, and analytical techniques. Provide detailed and transparent data, including replicates, concentrations, and error margins for reported values. Reassess the use of UV-Vis spectroscopy for antioxidant activity and clarify the calculation of inhibition rates. Discuss the significance of the chemical composition and antioxidant findings in the context of existing literature. Revise the language for clarity and remove any ambiguous or vague statements. Add references to support claims and methodology. <p>Conclusion: The manuscript has potential but currently falls short of being scientifically correct and thorough. With revisions to methodology, data presentation, and clarity, it can be made more robust and scientifically sound.</p>	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Enhance Focus: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add more recent studies directly relevant to lipid extraction, characterization, and antioxidant activity in Pangasius species or similar freshwater fish. 	

Review Form 3

	<p>2. Update Literature:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Replace or supplement older references with studies published within the last five years, particularly those using GC-MS and antioxidant assays. <p>3. Remove Unnecessary References:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Eliminate references unrelated to the manuscript's scope (e.g., phthalates in medical products, unrelated fish species). <p>4. Broaden Scope on Antioxidants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Include studies that focus on methodologies for evaluating antioxidant activity using DPPH and related assays in lipid-rich samples. <p>5. Modernize Methodology Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Cite recent articles about solvent extraction techniques and GC-MS advancements to better support the methodology. <p>Conclusion: The current references provide a foundation but are neither fully sufficient nor consistently relevant to the manuscript's focus. Updating the reference list to include more recent and targeted studies will significantly improve the scientific rigor and relevance of the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Suitable, it is better if revise the language for clarity and coherence, ensuring that technical terms are either simplified or briefly explained. My point of view:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The language is often convoluted and could be more concise. <input type="checkbox"/> Technical terms like "degree of hydrolysis," "DPPH radical scavenging activity," and "UV absorption" are not properly contextualized for readers. <input type="checkbox"/> Some phrases, such as "inhibition rate maximum of 0.0995% by the human body," are ambiguous and need clarification 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Since the sample used was the lipid extract from Pangasius pangasius meat, not the raw meat, the GC-MS analysis was conducted to determine the characteristics or profiling of the lipid extract. It is important to clarify at the beginning that the sample used is a lipid extract. Therefore, it would be less accurate to use the title "Chemical Composition."</p>	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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>
<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:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Astri Iga Siska</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Banyuwangi State Polytechnic, Indonesia</p>