



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_47484
Title of the Manuscript:	PHYTOCHEMICAL COMPOSITION AND IN VITRO ANTIOXIDANT ACTIVITY OF GOLDEN MELON (CUCUMIS MELO L) SEEDS FOR FUNCTIONAL FOOD APPLICATION
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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Firstable, the citations are not well. Most recent article is from 2014. In other words, the article should be reviewed / updated completely. - Introduction: Enough. The idea is good. - Material and Methods: is clear and enough too; - RESULTS AND DISCUSSION Phytochemical constituents (Table 1. Their results are very generic, introductory. This work brings a very interesting idea, but these results are very primary. Determining positive or negative, limit of quantification is welcome. If I use chromatographic techniques, more accuracy and sensitivity, maybe I can "see" more compounds, or not? In other words, their results are important, but unfortunately they do not have consistency to affirm many things. - The discussion of your work should be improved. It is modest in my opinion. You practically only present your results, but the discussion should be more argumentative. - Conclusion: modest. Improve. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Marcelo Barcellos da Rosa
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Santa Maria, Brazil