



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_27899
Title of the Manuscript:	Total Phenols Content and Antioxidant Power of Manuka Honey Is Related to 24hr Cytotoxicity Towards MCF-7 Breast Cancer Cells
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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Line 27: In the introduction describe more clearly what it is UMF 10+, 18+ etc., what information it gives, it is measured by laboratory or it is on the product label, if there is any scale? in 4.1 the discussion is incoherent, in first section is the same as in second one but it is a gap. Without consequences once is mg GAE/kg the other time mg-GAE/kg. Should be mg GA Eq./kg. Be more sophisticated in the description, you mention 15 references and write just one sentence about that. I don't think that there is a need to put Table 2, just mention in the text. 4.2. Everything should be one part, smoothly provide from studies to comparison. For sure there are some literature to compare FRAP measurement with other honeys and anticancer activity to compare. Too short part of conclusions, write more. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> UMF stands for unique manuka factor; the meaning is well-known by honey industry and scientific experts. We disagree with this comment and believe 4.1 is coherent. The MS has been corrected so that there is now consistent use e.g. 100mg GAE/kg throughout (see highlights) Table 2 provides a comprehensive summary of total phenols values for honeys compared with current results; the use of the Table allows as to be brief. The comparisons are also clearer for the reader. We believe the conclusion is brief and adequately summarizes the major findings. We have revised the conclusion in response to comments from another referee.
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Some editorial mistakes e.g. Line 48, Line 52, 70, 81, table 1 (Mg should be mg), line 188 (2000-mg should be 2000 mg) Wrong names of paragraphs: "3. Results and Discussion" and "4. Discussion". Is better to use antioxidant capacity, ability, properties, not power. Line 106: I don't like the expression: "From Table 1..." Three figures but not much of description make form them. I am sure that there is more information. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> line 48, gallic Acid is corrected to gallic acid; line 52 L/- glutamine; line 70; 200ul to 200µl, Table 1 corrected. the heading is corrected to "Results" the FRAP assays is abbreviation for ferric reducing antioxidant power – the assay measures antioxidant power and we feel this terminology is consistent. Changed to "According to data from Table (1). We believe in the adage "1 picture saves a thousand words", the graphics were designed painstakingly in the hope that they can convey what needed to be expressed.
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> First use the whole names and then abbreviations e.g. Line 86 but in many parts of manuscript. Don't know what means in line 83 "xs". Use scientific language not colloquial e.g line 209 "~". 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> line 86, Optical density (OD), two occurrences of the symbol "~" has been changed to "approximately", see line 110 & 216