



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_30500
Title of the Manuscript:	Oxidation of Electron-Rich Pollutants Using Peroxidase from Fenugreek Waste
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	References are old. They need improvements. The discussion section lacks flow of arguments, and as such it is too weak and does not address the main findings. There is no link between the conclusions and the results or discussions.	References for this study were selected on the basis of their relevance to the topic of the manuscript, rather than their chronology. We have, however, added more recent references as per your recommendation.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	See my comments on the attached manuscript	Revisions have been made as per your recommendations
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The discussion sections is rather vague. It is not an in depth analysis of the findings. Author (s) also include the literature in the discussion. These should be clearly separated.	We have rewritten the discussion section to improve the flow of information and provide an analysis of the results.