JournalName:	<u>Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports</u>
ManuscriptNumber:	Ms_AJARR_130216
TitleoftheManuscript:	PROTEINS:THEINGENIOUSWORKHORSEMOLECULE,ANARRATIVEREVIEW.
TypeoftheArticle	ReviewArticle

PART1:Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author'sFeedback (<i>Pleasecorrectthemanuscriptandhighlightthatpartin</i> the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Pleasewriteafewsentencesregardingtheimportan ce of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Thisarticleis 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 to pics 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.	
Isthetitleofthearticlesuitable? (Ifnotpleasesuggestanalternativetitle)	The title, Proteins: The Ingenious Workhorse Molecule, A Narrative Review,effectively conveys the article's majoridea,emphasisingtheimportanceofproteinsaswellasthereview'snarrativeformat. However, itmaybe more brief and specific in order to better reflect the article's scientific content. Hereareaalternativetitlesuggestion: Proteinsasthe Molecular Workhorses of Life: A Detailed Overview"	

Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you

suggesttheaddition(ordeletion)ofsomepointsinthi s section? Please write your suggestions here.

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:

SuggestionsforAddition:

- ExplicitMentionofKeyTopicsCovered: Includeabriefmentionofspecificaspectsdiscussedinthemanuscript, such as post-translational modifications, protein dynamics, and bioinformatics tools.
- 2. HighlightUniqueContributions: Emphasizethearticle'svalueinbridginggapsfornon-specialistsoritsfocusonintegratingclassical knowledge with modern advancements.
- ConcludewithPracticalRelevance:
 Mentiontheimplicationsofproteinstudiesforscientificresearch,medicalapplications,or biotechnology.

SuggestionsforDeletion:

- RemoveVaguePhrasing:
 Thephrase "aplethoraofhigh-soundingtitlesandthemes" may
 - Thephrase "aplethoraofhigh-soundingtitlesandthemes" may confuse readers and could be replaced with a more precise description of the article's focus.
- 2. SimplifyOverlyGeneralStatements: Avoidrepetition,suchas "Proteinsarevitalmolecules," sincethisisalreadywidelyknownandimplicit in the manuscript's context.

Review Form 3		
Isthemanuscriptscientifically,correct?Pleasewrit e here.	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.	
Arethereferencessufficientandrecent?Ifyouhave suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	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 extensiveandcovermanyaspectsofproteinscience, there are are avancements are extensive and to a supplemented with additional studies to reflect recent advancements. Recommendations Addnewerreferences to strengthen the manuscript's relevance, particularly in the sections discuss ing modern techniques and tools. Replacesome older references with more recent studies to maintain abalance between classical and contemporary knowledge. Includer eferences to case studies or real-world application stoprovide context for the ore tical discussions.	
Isthelanguage/Englishqualityofthearticlesuitable for scholarly communications?	Thelanguagequalityofthearticleisgenerallysuitableforscholarlycommunication,butthereareareasthat could be improved to ensure clarity, conciseness, and coherence. Below is a detailed evaluation: AreasforImprovement 1. RedundancyandRepetition: Certainconcepts,suchasproteindynamicsandstructurallevels,arerepeatedacrosssections. These redundancies could be removed to make the article more concise. 2. ConsistencyinTerminology: Sometermsareinconsistentlycapitalized(e.g.,"Proteins"vs."proteins,""CentralDogma"vs. "central dogma"), which can detract from the manuscript's professionalism.	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

		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:	Yousuf
Department, University & Country	Jagannath University, Bangladesh