



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Biochemistry</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRB_50773
Title of the Manuscript:	Theoretical Insight into Preferential Interaction Issues and Solution Structure, and Contentious Apparent Hydrated Molar Volume of Cosolute
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>)

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	The issue is pertinent and the examples are interesting.	Thank you for your greater interest in the quality of English language than in the subject matter of the manuscript and for accepting to review the manuscript.
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Careful designation of all abbreviations and the definition of the terms in good English would greatly improve the facility of reading	Abbreviations that were not defined will be checked and corrections made. All abbreviations have been defined.
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The article exceeds my competence, but I nevertheless followed it through for a while. I was nonetheless forced to cease the effort because of the very poor English and due to the insufficient explanation of the abbreviations and terms. The article should be re-written by a professional who both structures it decently and gives explanations in proper English, in an "economical" way, omitting repetitions and un-necessary phraseology. There should be a neater separation between the theoretical and experimental parts.	The manuscript followed the standard format-introduction, experimental, results and discussion, conclusion and reference. The theoretical section is separate from experimental section. Repetitions in the text may be eliminated if it does not serve any purpose. Error in grammar will be corrected; however, the entire manuscript should have been read considering the issues raised that needed proper conceptualisation that does totally refute information in literature; the equations in literature that is not dimensionally accurate need to be corrected as part of the motivation for this research. This is the "baby" of this research that is not characterised by total grammatical jargon or blunder.

**PART 2:**



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	See text above.