

Review Form 3

JournalName:	AsianJournalofAdvancedResearchandReports
ManuscriptNumber:	Ms_AJARR_130216
TitleoftheManuscript:	PROTEINS:THEINGENIOUSWORKHORSEMOLECULE,ANARRATIVEREVIEW.
TypeoftheArticle	ReviewArticle

PART1:Comments

	Reviewer'scomment	Author'sFeedback(Pleasecorrectthemanuscriptandhighlightthatpartin the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This article is valuable to the scientific community because it gives a thorough narrative on the structure, function, and biochemical properties of proteins, which are critical to understanding cellular activities. The review bridges the gap between traditional biochemistry and modern molecular biology by combining classical knowledge with new advances such as bioinformatics resources and computational techniques for protein analysis. Furthermore, its educational objective attempts to make complex protein-related topics more accessible to a broader audience, promoting interdisciplinary learning. This publication is not only a useful reference for academics, but also an introduction guide for students and non-specialists, helping to spread protein science knowledge.	I agree with the reviewer's comment and I express my gratitude for the useful insights.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not, please suggest an alternative title)	The title, Proteins: The Ingenious Workhorse Molecule, A Narrative Review, effectively conveys the article's major idea, emphasising the importance of proteins as well as the review's narrative format. However, it may be more brief and specific in order to better reflect the article's scientific content. Here are a few alternative title suggestions: "Proteins as the Molecular Workhorses of Life: A Detailed Overview"	I thank the reviewer for the concise and apt title suggestion. However, I think the inclusion of the word 'ingenious' in the original title by me is deliberate and conveys the brilliant multifaceted nature and activities of proteins. I have corrected the title thus- 'Proteins: The Ingenious workhorse Molecule, A Detailed Overview.'

Review Form 3

<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The article's abstract is clear and provides a basic overview of the material, including proteins' important significance, structural complexity, synthesis, and cross-disciplinary value. However, it may benefit from more information and specificity to better reflect the manuscript's full nature. Here are some recommendations to improve:</p> <p>Suggestions for Addition:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">Explicit Mention of Key Topics Covered: Include a brief mention of specific aspects discussed in the manuscript, such as post-translational modifications, protein dynamics, and bioinformatics tools.Highlight Unique Contributions: Emphasize the article's value in bridging gaps for non-specialists or its focus on integrating classical knowledge with modern advancements.Conclude with Practical Relevance: Mention the implications of protein studies for scientific research, medical applications, or biotechnology. <p>Suggestions for Deletion:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">Remove Vague Phrasing: The phrase "<i>a plethora of high-sounding titles and themes</i>" may confuse readers and could be replaced with a more precise description of the article's focus.Simplify Overly General Statements: Avoid repetition, such as "<i>Proteins are vital molecules</i>," since this is already widely known and implicit in the manuscript's context.	<p>I am grateful to the reviewer for the comments and corrections. I have modified the abstract to include the corrections.</p> <p>I have included a brief mention of specific aspects of proteins discussed in paper (lines 26 – 28).</p> <p>I have highlighted the unique contributions of the paper in lines 35 -38.</p> <p>I have mentioned the implications of protein studies for protein research and its medical applications in lines 28 -31</p> <p>I have removed the vague phrase 'a plethora of high-sounding titles and themes.'</p> <p>I have removed the sentence 'proteins are vital molecules'.</p>
--	--	--

Review Form 3

<p>Isthemanuscriptscientifically,correct?Pleasewrite here.</p>	<p>The manuscript looks to be scientifically reliable and well-referenced, containing thorough information about protein structure, production, and biochemical characteristics. It comprises reputable sources, fundamental principles such as the core dogma of molecular biology, and cutting-edge bioinformatics toolsandprotein-study approaches.</p>	<p>I appreciate the reviewer's assessment and comments.</p>
<p>Arethereferencesufficientandrecent?Ifyouhavesuggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The manuscript contains a substantial number of references, ranging from foundational studies (e.g., Anfinsen, 1973; Crick, 1958) to more recent works (e.g., Ramazi et al., 2020; Wu et al., 2024). While the references are extensiveandcovermanyaspectsofprotein science,thereareareaswherethereferencescouldbemore up-to-date or supplemented with additional studies to reflect recent advancements.</p> <p>Recommendations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Addnewerreferencestostrengthenthemanuscript'srelevance,particularlyinthesectionsdiscussing modern techniques and tools.• Replacesomeolderreferenceswithmorerecentstudiestomaintainabalancebetweenclassicaland contemporary knowledge.• Includereferencetocasestudiesorreal-worldapplicationstoprovidecontextfortheoretical discussions.	<p>I am grateful to the reviewer for the enriching comments and recommendations.</p> <p>I have added newer references to back up modern techniques and tools (lines 212 – 217).</p> <p>I have included real-world applications with references(lines 91 – 96).</p> <p>I have included real= world applications in lines 221 – 225.</p>
<p>Isthelanguage/Englishqualityofthearticlesuitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Thelanguagequalityofthearticleisgenerallysuitableforscholarlycommunication,butthereareareasthat could be improved to ensure clarity, conciseness, and coherence. Below is a detailed evaluation:</p> <p>AreasforImprovement</p> <p>1. RedundancyandRepetition:</p> <p>Certainconcepts,suchasproteindynamicsandstructurallevels,arerepeatedacrosssections. These redundancies could be removed to make the article more concise.</p> <p>2.ConsistencyinTerminology:</p> <p>Sometermsareinconsistentlycapitalized(e.g., "Proteins"vs."proteins,""CentralDogma"vs. "central dogma"), which can detract from the manuscript's professionalism.</p>	<p>I am grateful to the reviewer for areas for improvement detected.</p> <p>I have effected the corrections to exclude the redundancy and inconsistency.</p>
<p>Optional/Generalcomments</p>		

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer’s comment</p>	<p>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)</p>
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p>	<p>I have no ethical issues to declare</p>