



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_29829
Title of the Manuscript:	Protein Aggregation A Review
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

	Editor's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Compulsory REVISION comments	Please find enclosed my remarks concerning the manuscript number IJBCRR_29829. Some minor corrections are compulsory before publication. Some points need to be corrected. 1. A lot of little corrections are compulsory: - in abstract: L3 “under variety of conditions.” - in abstract: L6-7 “... a variety of method has been used to inhibit protein aggregation, it involved structural (internal) and environmental (external) modifications.” - in Table 1: L64 “proteinaceous” - L134: delete one space between “easily” and “since” - L202: The sentence is not correct - L229: “unfolded intermediates” - L230: A final point need to replace the coma - L244: No majuscules on disulfide, non-disulfide and oxidation - L245: “Maillard” - L291-292 : This sentence is repeated at the end of the same paragraph. Please delete one. - L346: space between the coma and “lysozyme” - L350: space between “give” and “3D” - L377: space between the coma and “a” - L451: Majuscule on “Unfortunately,” 2. The paragraph 3 entitled “Type of protein aggregation” need to be disseminated in the paragraph 2 entitled “Proteins aggregations” on the appropriate places. 3. Please add a number and a legend on the figure and	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	improve the resolution of this figure. 4. The table 2 is not clear. We cannot see the correspondence between the columns. As an example: SEC-HPLC has Quantitation application? It is not clear for the reader. 5. Three references are duplicated in the references list: 75 was cited as ref 58 76 was cited as ref 6 77 was cited as ref 57 Please delete 75 to 77 in the list and correct in the text (lines 514 and 520) 6. Reference list redaction is as important as the text. A lot of corrections are compulsory in the reference list, please take time to check very carefully all occurrences: - there are a lot of spaces missing in order to separate two words, - there are a lot of word cut by “-“, - ref 29 to 45, please change the order of family name and initials	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Good review, which is welcoming in order to complete a gap in the field.	

Editor's Details:

Mylène Gobert, Unit Quality of Animal Products Centre, National, Institute of Agronomic Research, France