



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_29804
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF FERMENTATION ON PHYSICOCHEMICAL PROPERTIES AND IN-VITRO RADICAL SCAVENGING ABILITY OF Citrullus vulgaris
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 article needs lots of compulsory revisions. The article presents the use of fermentation for the production of “ogiri” from <i>Citrullus vulgaris</i> (melon seed), The author compared some chemical and nutritional changes in the raw seeds and the fermented product. The author needs to improve on the introduction part of the write-up as well as the results and discussion. The author should improve the grammar and the writing style. Here under listed are some specific corrections the author should also pay attention to in order to improve the quality of the work.	Line 9 – comma applied.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 9 - use comma instead of hyphen. Be consistent. Line 11- involves Line 11- watching or washing? Line 11- use 4 h instead of 4 hrs and apply space. Apply this subsequently Line 12 - 35 °C not 35 °C Line 14- Remove equally and apply space in 0.4 N Line 23- 1 introduction Line 26 – 30. Definition of fermentation should come before its advantages and the facts stated in lines 27 & 28 should be referenced	Line 11- involves corrected. Line 11- watching replaced by washing Line 11- 4 h consistently used. Line 12 - 35 °C used instead of 35 °C. Line 14- equally removed. Line 23- Numbering removed. Line 26 – 30: appropriately placed
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 31- 32. This statement is not clear. Please reconstruct for clarity Line 35- 36 please check grammar Line 38-39. Reconstruct Line 42- “fermentation is by chance”. What do you mean by this statement? Lines 44- replace “ogiri” by “it” Line 47-49- requires a reference Line 51-“ According to free radical theory of aging, cells continuously produce free radicals....” Due to what?. Do cells just produce radicals or free radicals are generated as a result of oxidative stress?	Line 31- 32: statement is reconstructed. Line 35- 36: Observed. Line 38-39. Reconstructed. Line 42- Naturally fermented, no use of starter culture. Lines 44- Done. Line 47-49- Observed. Line 51- as a result of oxidative stress.
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 54- Citrullus vulgaris is a good source of vitamin (Sodeke, 2005). This should come after line 58 Line 59-60. The author fail to convince us why this work is needed. The word “however is not appropriate for introducing this part. This part should be re-written and the author should tell us the significance of this present study. Line 62- 2 Materials and methods Line 64- check grammar Line 68- put a full stop after Nigeria and start a new sentence Line 71- washed with what?	Line 54: placed as requested. Line 59-60: conviction now supplied, however is removed. Line 62- 2: Done Line 64- correct as appropriate please. Line 68- Done. Line 71- washed with water.
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 76 & 77 – align Line 84- 2.2 not 2.3 Line 85 -88. Check grammar and use of punctuation. Kindly insert space between values and units 20 g, 250 ml. Line 87- you only calibrated the pH meter with a buffer pH 7? What about pH 4 calibration? Line 96- “Five grams (5 g) “ use one style and be consistent with it. Line 100- Provide the formula used for calculating the moisture content. Line 102- kindly make this procedure clearer. What was the weight you used? How did you	Line 76 & 77 – aligned. Line 84-Numbering removed. Line 85 -88: corrected as appropriate. Line 87- calibration done with buffer 7 Line 96- Compliance taken. Line 100- formula provided. 2 g sample was used.
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	determine the fat content? You mentioned that your sample pre-contained “at least 240 units of Vitamin A”, how did you determine this? Line 121- Five should be five Line 124- persisted Line 138- please check grammar Line 146- “at low temperature” be exact Line 152- 3 Results not III. Be consistent Line 152- is this section Results and discussion? Because there was no section for discussion. Line 153-154- “The effect of fermentation	It is taken that 1 g fat can not be realized from 2 g sample of melon seed even from practices. Line 121- corrected. Line 124- corrected. Line 138- please correct as appropriate. Line 146: corrected Line 152- 3: III removed. Line 152- corrected. Line 153-154- corrected.
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	on the nutritional quality of fermented and unfermented <i>Citrullus vulgaris</i> ('ogiri')." This statement is incomplete and makes no good meaning. Line 153-156- there are lots of issues with this paragraph. 1. You mentioned here there was a result of the analysis of the number of colonies isolated, cultural and morphological of the isolated organism. How did you isolate the organism? How did you carry out these experiments? I asked this questions because you never mentioned the methods used in your Section 2. And there were no results for these experiments. Line 166- Table 1. The author needs to	Line 153-156- It is deleted from this entire paper. This belongs to another publication. It was a mix up. Line 166- It is now represented in this paper.
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	explain why the total titrable acid increased after fermentation while the pH remains exactly the same? Result section The results were not properly presented. Values on tables 1 and 2 appears to have being from one sample test. If not, there were no errors and statistical analysis to show if there were significant differences between values. For instance, Vitamins tested are important antioxidants, some of the values of some these antioxidant seems close. The author did not tell us why and he didn't convince us, using scientific terms, the mechanism of their action. Overall, the values	Result section Three different tests were carried out for each of the parameters determined and the average of each were found (kept in the appendix) before presenting it for publication. Statistical analysis is now presented. Conclusion Conclusion strengthened.
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	should be well aligned Conclusion The conclusion section is too shallow for a scientific work. References Line 249- Odunfa S. A (1981a). There was no b? Line 251- Odunfa S.A (1985) was written as 1985a in the article on line 43 Line 261 – 268 - Ref 21 and 22 are the same. Line 277 - Wang, J. and Fung, D.Y. (1996) was written as Wang and Fang (1996) on line 163	Line 249- corrected Line 251- corrected Line 261 – 268 - One is expunged for the other. Line 277 – corrected.
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	See attached comment	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		