Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Research in Biochemistry**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJRB_129900**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Variation in total sugar and soluble protein contents during the ripening of the fruit of Pancovia laurentii (De Wild.) Gilg ex De (Sapindaceae0**
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/
Benefits for Reviewers: https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers

Review Form 3

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	**Author's Feedback** *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in 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.	***Pancovia laurentii i*s an underutilized fruit and most of the research wasnot done in fruit physiology and fruit biochemistry.**	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	**No. Suitable title is "Variation in total sugar and soluble protein content during ripening of *Pancovia laurentii* fruit"**	
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.	**Abstract is comprehensive**	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes scientifically written.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	1. No. add 10-15 references from past 10 years to support results. **But references should be arranged according to journal format only.** **Sample** Hilly, M., Adams, M. L., & Nelson, S. C. (2002). A study of digit fusion in the mouse embryo. Clinical and Experimental Allergy, 32(4), 489-498. 2. **Some of the references marked in yellow did not match with citation. Those references should be corrected.**	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	No. The authors have to rewrite the manuscript in simple correct English Language and submit revised manuscript at the earliest. If authors are from non-native English speaking country, they can take help of a person who is well versed with English.	
Optional/General comments	**PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENT**	

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Venkata Satish Kuchi**
Department, University & Country	**College of Horticulture, Anantharajupeta, Dr. YSR Horticultural University, India**