



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_37444
Title of the Manuscript:	Disulphide bond reduction of RNase A by drug metosartan a comparative study
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>)

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	As I see the paper, there are a lot of problems. Trivial and redundant facts were discussed. None of the article parts (Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results, Discussion) were written and presented correctly. The Conclusion, which actually was presented as Discussion, was not possible to draw regarding the results presented in the paper. The references were quoted randomly in the text, or omitted where they suppose to be quoted. Additionally, it was very hard to read the paper because the language needs to improve.	Dear sir/mam, Yes I agree with you. Material and methods section was clearly represented and minor corrections in the remaining sections was done. Conclusion was added according to the results. References was ordered as mentioned by you. Eswari beeram etal., reference was added and simplified the language. The corrections in all are highlited with yellow.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		