



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_28493
Title of the Manuscript:	Biochemical Impacts of Radiation Processing on Grapes and Artichoke Agro Industrial Wastes
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	General comments: The theme of the evaluated manuscript is interesting. The present study was conducted to test the possible biochemical impacts of radiation processing on wastes of grapes and artichoke, as well as to elucidate the physiological and biochemical effects of feeding growing male Wistar rats on diets supplemented with the processed agro industrial wastes at dose levels of 10, 20 and 30 kGy. However, I have several concerns about the manuscript: 1) The manuscript is poorly structured. The introduction does not present the main motivations of the study and the hypotheses of work. It is very important that the authors make clear what the objectives defined for the study. 2) "Materials and Methods": a. The correct is Wistar rats and not Wister. b. Clarify the reasons for using male rats. w. Clarify how many animals were distributed to each experimental group. I have the impression that the sample size used is too small, negatively influencing the findings. I believe this explains the absence of statistically significant differences for some evaluated parameters. This is a serious problem of the manuscript. Few animals were evaluated. c. The. Clarifying the term "animals Were examined by veterinary". This expression is very subjective. d. Better explain the sentence: The animals Were healthy and clinically free of internal and external parasites. a specific examination was performed? Clarify! e. Clarify the period of diets offering (8 weeks). Why this time? Some specific criteria? f. I do not recommend the use of 3D graphics (Figure 1). I suggest present mean $\pm$ standard deviation.	Thank you for your useful comments and suggestions on the language and structure of our manuscript. We have modified the manuscript accordingly, and detailed corrections are listed below: 1-√ The aim of the study was clarified in in both abstract and introduction. 2a. √ It was corrected. b. √ Unfortunately, the female sex is largely avoided in biomedical research because of its hormonal fluctuations (estrogen/progesterone) during the menstruation cycle. This fluctuations may cause metabolic alterations that delays the effects of experimental diets used, while in male rats this problem is not faced. w. √ Each group contains 6-7 rats. We began with 7/group, but some rats died. Nevertheless, we do not think that it affects the results because no individual variations were present in animals. c,d√ Animals were examined for any abnormalities (inner, outer parasites and deformations) by veterinary before being delivered to the lab. e. √ The ideal time for the study is between 6 and 8 weeks (Chien <i>et al.</i>, 2016. In press. Effects of herbal mixture extracts on obesity in rats fed a high-fat diet. Journal of food and



SDI Review Form 1.6

	3) The results of the regression analysis were not observed. To review! 4) There was not an item of "conclusions" in the manuscript. 5) The discussion of the results need to be further enhanced, not limited to comparing the results with similar studies. The discussion is very "gossip." 6) It is essential a careful review in English. Ethical Issues: Authors should clarify whether the study was approved by an ethics committee	drug analysis. Available online at www.sciencedirect.com) f. ✓ The graph was changed upon your request. 3. ✓ It was added below table (2, 3 and 4). 4. ✓ Conclusions were added. 5. ✓ Some changes were done on the discussion. 6. ✓ It was revised. Ethical approval was added in the manuscript according to the journal template.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		