



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>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?</p> <p>in 4.1 the discussion is incoherent, in first section is the same as in second one but it is a gap.</p> <p>Without consequences once is mg GAE/kg the other time mg-GAE/kg. Should be mg GA Eq./kg.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Too short part of conclusions, write more.</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>Some editorial mistakes e.g.</p> <p>Line 48, Line 52, 70, 81, table 1 (Mg should be mg), line 188 (2000-mg should be 2000 mg)</p> <p>Wrong names of paragraphs: "3. Results and Discussion" and "4.Discussion".</p> <p>Is better to use antioxidant capacity, ability, properties, not power.</p> <p>Line 106: I don't like the expression: "From Table 1..."</p> <p>Three figures but not much of description make form them. I am sure that there is more information.</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	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 "~".	
---	--	--

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Małgorzata Przygodzła
Department, University & Country	Sensory Laboratory, Institute of Animal Reproduction and Food Research of Polish Academy of Sciences in Olsztyn, Poland