



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Biochemistry
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>)



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Although the underlying motivation for the study is good, this paper is not well written, and it will make the reader confused. Thus, I cannot recommend it for publication in its current form. The authors are advised to spend more time on their paper to enhance the readability. In addition, they should also consider the following points.</p> <p>1 – Figure 1 does not show any graph other than numbers in the x and y axes. 2 – There is no fitting parameters provided for Figs. 2 and 3. 3 – What is Tte coefficient of determination, as written in the footnote of Table 1? 4 – Background references are greatly missing in the ms. 5 – The objective of the study, as written in the introduction section, is unclear. It needs significant revision. 6 – A significant part of the paper comprises Equations and related discussions. I ask the authors to move most of it to the supplementary section. However, they must keep the key components in the main body of the ms. 7 – There are many grammatical mistakes. These should be eliminated.</p> <p>I suggest the authors to submit a significantly revised version of this ms for further evaluation and possible publication.</p>	<p>Thank you for your observation . The figures which were merged into three separate figures, 1, 2 & 3 are now separated. The coefficient of determination values are indicated in the table, Table 1! The symbol used was defined under the table. Part of the theoretical section that appears separable from the other part is moved to the supplementary section as supplementary text. Grammatical errors have been substantially eliminated. The references let out have been included.</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:



SDI Review Form 1.6

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