



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: - Line 8: a new sentence begins after “flavonoids” - Line 16: typographic error “hub” for “herb” Introduction: - Lines 26 and 31: put a full stop after reference - 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”). - 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. - Line 38: “plant” should follow “annual” to complete the sentence. ➤ 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? Methodology: I think is acceptable Results: I think is ok 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. - Attention! Lines 239-240: incomplete sentence. - Line 243: typographic error: cowpea in the place of green pea. Conclusion: I think is ok	
Minor REVISION comments	Manuscript is grammatically acceptable, but needs few language checks. As well, there should be strict adherence to a specific referencing style in entire manuscript.	
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>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tabé Franklin Nyenty
Department, University & Country	Department Of Biomedical Sciences, University Of Ngaoundere, Cameroon