



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

	Reviewer'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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. In lines 163-167, the authors described a process of aggregation through chemical degradation(s), however, this reviewer think the explanation for chemical degradation is obscure. The meaning of chemical degradation is chemically-induced cleavage of polypeptide and/or a portion of aggregates can lead to degradation of proteins? The authors should clarify and include further explanation(s) in this section. 2. In section 5.2, the authors summarized analytical methods to detect protein aggregation, however, another fluorescence-based quantitative assays are available (e.g., fluorescence resonance energy transfer, fluorescence correlation spectroscopy, and number and brightness principle). The authors should reconsider to include a short explanation for another fluorescence-based assays and related references (typically, PMID: 14622574, PMID: 26757674, PMID: 26489794, and PMID: 27570076). 3. In line 274, the authors illustrate a typical state of immobilization of ThT, however, this image cannot be clearly distinguished because of low resolution. The authors should improve the resolution of the image. In addition, this reviewer believes that a short explanation of colours in this figure may help understandings for general readers.	As per said comments i have added all the suggested points. Thank you
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	In this manuscript, there are a lot of errors of space-out (e.g., line 256, 263, 324, 415, and so on). The authors should carefully check and correct the errors.	I have done the correction.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1. In line 20, the authors describe Keratin as a typical material. I believe collagen is also major components of the human body, so that this reviewer recommends that the authors may reconsider the addition of collagen as an example. 2. In line 174, what do the authors think about UV-irradiation-induced protein aggregation (PMID: 15534584 as a reference)? This reviewer recommends that the authors may include a description for induction of aggregation by UV in the physical aggregation.	As per said comments i have added all the suggested points. Thank you
---	--	---