

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ IJBCRR_88486
Title of the Manuscript:	IN VITRO AND IN VIVO ANTIOXIDANT CAPACITY OF COWPEA (VIGNA UNGUICULATA) GROWN IN COPPER POLLUTED SOIL
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://www.journalarrb.com/index.php/ARRB/editorial-policy>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The "Abbreviation" section should go into the materials and methods and presented as a table.</p> <p>Combine "Antioxidant Status", "In vivo Antioxidant Assays", "In vitro Antioxidant Assays", and "MDA" sections into one section.</p> <p>Reformat all tables (1-14) to make clear the significant differences by the letter reports. Either values in a column are significantly different or the rows are. This is not explained and the way the tables are arranged makes interpreting the results confusing.</p> <p>Table 15: Include the reference to your "prerequisite for a sandy-loam" claim that you have in the Discussion.</p> <p>Need a "Conclusion" section where a sentence or two explaining the need for further research would be necessary.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>The font needs to be consistent throughout the whole document.</p> <p>Some grammar issues need to be resolved throughout the document.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>This is a well-written paper, especially the "Discussion" section. However, there are so many treatments, and the statistics are not presented in a clear manner. Although the use of a simplified statistical method is wise to analyse the data with so many treatments, the results do need to be explained in a more coherent manner.</p>	

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	James Burke
Department, University & Country	University of Arkansas, United States of America