



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	The results are very interesting, especially the in vivo experiments. Therefore, I believe that the article has relevance for food industry. However, the article requires several corrections described below. It is necessary that the authors do a great review of grammatical errors and write the article in the journal's standards. (http://www.sciencedomain.org/page/general-guideline-for-authors) Abstract: "It should not exceed 300 words in length". Where is the keywords? Tables & Figures: "Tables & figures should be placed inside the text. Tables and figures should be presented as per their appearance in the text. It is suggested that the discussion about the tables and figures should appear in the text before the appearance of the respective tables and figures". It is lacking add conclusions at the end of the article. Citations and references are not standardized; I suggest that the authors check norms and articles published in this journal. The results are very interesting, especially the in vivo experiments. Therefore, I believe that the article has relevance for food industry. However, the article requires corrections. It is necessary that the authors do a great review of grammatical errors and write the article in the journal's standards.	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: Abstract was summarized to 306 words. Keywords were included. Tables & Figures were placed inside the text. We tried that the discussion about the tables and figures appear in the text before the appearance of the respective tables and figures, but sometimes we could not because of the available space. Conclusions were added. The article was corrected, revised grammatically and written according to the journal's template and standards.
Minor REVISION comments	It is lacking spaces between subheads. Moreover, I suggest that the authors should divide "into numbered sections with	All comments were done, except for Line 211: because the capital letters were abbreviations,



SDI Review Form 1.6

	brief headings. Starting from introduction with section 1. subsections should be numbered (for example 2.1 (then 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.2, etc.), up to three levels" to standardize this article with others published in this journal. Line 46: I suggest that the authors should change the comma by a point: "diseases 2), In such conditions". In the same line, I believe that it would be: antioxidants are, instead of antioxidants is. Line 92: The authors should check commas and points. Line 103: The authors should change "Plant" for "plant". Line 132: It is lacking a point. Line 151: The authors should standardize the spacing. Check in all text because sometimes it is written "110°C for 24h" and others "110 °C for 24 h". Line 185: Check: "for 5 min. gasses flow rates". Line 190: The authors should change "HCL" for HCl, because this is a symbol chemical. Line 200: It is lacking a point. Line 203: Change "2, 2-diphenyl" for 2,2-diphenyl. Line 211: Check spacing and capital letters in the middle of this paragraph. Check: Sometimes, in the text it is written "foodstuffs" and others "food stuffs". In <i>Results and Discussion</i>: Line 265: I suggest that the authors should change "It was obvious" for "It was suggest" because in the table 4 there was a small increase of total phenolic for grape of 2.56 % (10 KGy) and 3.85 % (30 KG), but in 20 KGy there was a decrease of 15.38 %. Line 308: Remove the comma. Table 5: Standardize the size and font of the numbers. Line 357: Check "radiation -induced" Figure 1: Improve the visual quality of the picture, especially the legend.	ALT (alanine transaminase) and AST (aspartate transaminase). N.B. Lines numbers were changed according to the editing process. <i>Results and Discussion:</i> All comments were done. Figure 1 was replaced by another one upon one of the reviewers request.
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Table 9: Change the second LDL for VLDL, LDL is duplicate in the table. Line 429: Check this line.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		