**SDI Review Form 1.6**

| | |
|---|---|
| Journal Name: | **International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review** |
| Manuscript Number: | **Ms_IJBCRR_39855** |
| Title of the Manuscript: | **Phytochemical profile and free radical scavenging activities of methanol extract of green pea** |
| 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 | **Abstract:**<br>- Line 8: a new sentence begins after "*flavonoids"*<br>- Line 16: typographic error *"hub*" for *"herb"*<br><br>**Introduction:**<br>- Lines 26 and 31: put a full stop after reference<br>- Line 35: references 3 and 4 should rather be in a single square bracket separated by a **comma (,)** (please consult the ***"Vancouver referencing style guide"***).<br>- Line 35-37: I don't think I agree with authors on that holistic point of view. Drugs can be defined variously, depending on the therapeutic objective for which they are elaborated. This can cover a range of activities including those covered by nutraceuticals so therefore, the difference given between the two I think, is unfounded.<br>- Line 38: "plant" should follow "annual" to complete the sentence.<br>➢ The research was designed to quantitatively and qualitatively analyse the phytochemical composition which, I think, is pertinent. However, I'm afraid similar studies must have been carried out because the antioxidant, antimicrobial, hypoglycaemic activities (as said by authors) have earlier been reported which, as a result must have inspired such studies. OR authors are simply trying to confirm similar studies? If such studies exist, are there any discrepancies?<br><br>**Methodology:** I think is acceptable<br><br>**Results:** I think is ok<br><br>**Discussion:** I think is good, but in-text references in this section are not in conformity with any style and hope the ***"Vancouver referencing style guide"***) will be of help to authors.<br>- **Attention!** Lines 239-240: incomplete sentence.<br>- Line 243: typographic error: cowpea in the place of green pea.<br><br>**Conclusion:** I think is ok | I have effected the corrections in the manuscripts<br>Line 35-37: I have rephrased the point around nutraceuticals without comparing it with the conventional drugs<br>However line 38 about the aim of this study is justifiable because no such studies have been carried out on methanol extract of *Pisum sativum*<br><br>The referencing style has been adjusted to Vancouver style |
| | Manuscript is grammatically acceptable, but needs few language checks. As well, there should be strict adherence to a specific referencing style in entire manuscript. | This has been corrected in the maunscript |
| **Optional/General** comments | Manuscript is worth publishable upon effective revision and clarification of certain observations. | |

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.
Kindly see the following link:
http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20