



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Food Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AFSJ_47629
Title of the Manuscript:	Study the effect of watermelon white rind extract as decreased the detrimental of soybean oil in vivo
Type of the Article	<u>Original research paper</u>

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	Title: The title of the manuscript is ambiguous. Author should reframe the title.	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Abstract: 1) Author is advised to stick to a uniform unit of measurement for all elemental composition of "watermelon white rind extract". Applicable also to Table 1. 2) Is "chrome" the same with chromium? 3) Unit of measurement for iodine number? Also check Table 2</p> <p>Introduction: structure the introduction to contain the following i. General background ii. Challenges/ problems iii. Scholarly articles in addressing the challenges/problems iv. Research gap that this article is aimed at addressing v. Objective of this research</p> <p>Methods: For the purpose of reproducibility, provide stepwise details of procedures used in obtaining results</p> <p>Results: Duplicate measurements of all quantitative parameters are necessary</p> <p>Discussion: Results of Table 1-3 and 5 have not been discussed and compared with other scholarly works in the concerned area.</p> <p>Conclusion: Should state clearly if the objective of this research has been achieved, limitations and or needs for further investigations, etc.</p>	<p>Thanks for your valuable comments. The mail contained the following corrections:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- The title was corrected 2- Chrome is corrected to chromium 3- All units in table 1 were ppm 4- The abstract was arranged to: aim, methods, results, conclusion. 5- No ethical issues 6- All results were the mean of duplicate determinations
Optional/General comments	Reframe the title, be specific with objectives, discuss exhaustively results obtained, empower the conclusion, and pay attention to grammar.	

PART 2:

	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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u>	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	