



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_23853
Title of the Manuscript:	Studies on the oxidative balance in rats maintained on ripe Musa paradisiaca peel
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		
Minor REVISION comments	This paper deals with the feed of ripe <i>Musa paradisiaca</i> peel to rat, results in the Superoxide dismutase activity, catalase activity and concentration of malondialdehyde in some organs of the rats. From these results deduced this kind feed can result in the oxidative balance. This is very important issue for bioactivity and biochemistry, so I supported to be published after minor revision. 1, The oxidative balance in a biological system is very complex, because it contains many redox systems as well as the biochemical reaction balances. If it is not clearly defined, it better to changed way to describe it. 2, In the last part of the result section, there are several tables listed one by one, without analysis and description about the table and with no conclusion about the tables. This is not the common way in a published article. 3, the conclusion section seems not a summary of this paper. 4, What is the reason "only up to 50% replacement of corn starch by processed ripe <i>Musa parasidiaca</i> peel".	With due respect, I think the conclusion is apt and gives a summary of the findings in the research. All the tables are properly titled (i.e. described) and the discussion of the result contained in tabled was done under the Result and Discussion. The reason "only up to 50% replacement of corn starch by processed ripe <i>Musa parasidiaca</i> peel" is inferred from the results and provided in the last paragraph under Result and Discussion.
Optional/General comments		