



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_26125
Title of the Manuscript:	Opuntia sp. Cactus: Biological Characteristics, Cultivation and Applications
Type of the Article	Review paper

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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	In the present manuscript authors perform a review of the wide variety of applications of Opintia sp. cactus, including human food and animal feed, agriculture, medicine, pharmaceutical and cosmetic industries, and even as insecticide agent. In general, the manuscript is well written, providing the most important references about this issue. Minor revision.	We thank the referee for generally positive comments to improve the manuscript. We made the changes suggested along the paper.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>I suppose that values of organic compounds are expressed in a fresh weight basis and those of mineral composition in a dried weight basis. However this issue should be clarified in the revised manuscript.</p> <p>I suggest moving "Animal Feed" section to the first place in section 5 and after that writing "Human Food" and "Health and Medicine" sections.</p> <p>References 75 and 76 are not cited in the text.</p>	<p>We agree with the reviewer's comments and the sentence "The values of organic compounds were expressed in a fresh weight basis and the values of mineral composition were expressed in a dried weight basis" was included in the text.</p> <p>With most of our respect, we disagree from the suggested changes in Section 5.</p> <p>Sorry, it was a mistake and reference 75 was included in the text (page 9). However, reference 76 had already been cited on page 9. Nevertheless, with the modifications suggested by the reviewers, the order of references changed.</p>
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		