



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_46989
Title of the Manuscript:	CHEMICAL COMPOSITION, NUTRITIONAL VALUES AND ANTIBACTERIAL ACTIVITIES OF WATER MELON SEED (Citrullus lanatus)
Type of the 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	<p>- The word watermelon is together. Correct in all manuscript.</p> <p>Abstract:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Why the authors in the title only put watermelon, if they also studied ginger? - "The vitamin composition of watermelon seeds indicated 0.030mg/100g for vitaminB₁, 0.00055 vitaminB₂, 0.6405 mg/100g for vitaminB₃, 0.0235mg /100g vitaminB₆ and 0.001 for vitaminB₁₂." Missing units. - Missing main conclusions of work in abstract. - Authors need rewrite abstract. <p>Keywords are not specific to manuscript. Select other keywords, as for example: seeds, watermelon, antimicrobial activity...</p> <p>Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The objectives of work may be together with introduction - Poor introduction, I suggested put more studies about seeds of watermelon and less history and origin of plants. - Again, why did the authors write about ginger? <p>Materials and methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Missing reference of method in section "Preparation of Extract". Furthermore, with the conditions described, namely: "concentrated to dryness by evaporation at 450C in a water bath for 3days." some of the compounds tested were lost or damaged. - The authors did not describe the methodology used to evaluate the nutritional composition, as well as the methodologies used to quantify alkaloids, phenols...., but in results these values appear. <p>Results</p> <p>Missing statistical analysis of results The results are expressed in g for fresh or dry weight?</p> <p>All manuscript is confused, and lacks scientific content.</p> <p>English need to be improved.</p>	
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	