



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Biochemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRB_44599
Title of the Manuscript:	SEPARATION AND OPTIMIZATION OF A SUCROSE DENSITY GRADIENT CENTRIFUGATION PROTOCOL FOR ISOLATION OF PERIPHERAL BLOOD MONONUCLEAR CELLS (PBMC)
Type of the Article	Original Research 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:

(<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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In the document were remarked the grammatical corrections. 2. It's necessary review the format of references and homogenize them. 3. Since the article proposes a new sucrose gradient technique, it is necessary to be very specific first in the explanation of the technique and second in the reagents used, particularly in the type of sucrose used (brand, catalogue number), this with the objective of providing certainty to the reader of the reproducibility of the technique. 4. Remember that when a technique is published it must show its reliability. 5. It would also be valid to present the difference between samples treated with ficoll and sucrose. 6. In addition, the advantages and disadvantages of one technique can be mentioned in the discussion. 7. In the photographs that you present, you can see the first phase very red, that means that the blood was haemolysed? 8. It was necessary to carry out lysis of residual erythrocytes, if this is correct, with what type of solution did they perform the lysis? 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	The article presented is original and very interesting, proposes a new technique and therefore we must be very careful in the publication of it. I think it should be published as soon as the comments are sustained, this with the aim of improving it and that the technique can be reproduced by anyone who reads it.	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Beatriz Elina Martínez Carrillo
Department, University & Country	Universidad Autónoma del Estado de México, México.