



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_65055
Title of the Manuscript:	Study on proximate analysis, phenolic content and antioxidant capacity of fish singgang extracts
Type of the Article	ORIGINAL RESEARCH PAPER

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/journal/10/editorial-policy>)

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The English in the present manuscript is not of publication quality and require major improvement. The structure of some sentences makes it difficult to understand the meaning of a sentence. Thus, I suggest the authors to seek any third-party service and to improve English quality. The names of some spices and herbs are given as common (well-known names), others are given in Latin, I suggest following the same naming strategy. Section 2.1 In the sample preparation section, the authors should indicate how the control sample was prepared. Section 2.2 ...into four different solvents which were 100% ethanol, 70% ethanol, 50% ethanol and 100% aqueous... Is the last solvent distilled water? If so, it should be indicated as distilled water or pure water... The term "aqueous" suggests a solution, and the solution is not 100% water. Section 2.7 The procedure was repeated with control tube but the samples were put at the last step of the procedure after reagent 5. This step of the procedure is not clear, - could authors explain? 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 2.6 The absorbance of the spectrophotometer was measured and reported at 510 nm... (The absorbance of the sample...) Section 2.7 ... the solution was measured using spectrophotometer... (...absorbance was measured...). The manuscript subheadings and sub-subheadings do not comply with the general guidelines for authors provided by the journal. Spacing must be consistent throughout the document (see section 3.3). 	
Optional/General comments	<p>This is an interesting topic that may be of interest to the readers of the journal. The authors present a study that analyzes the potentially beneficial properties of <i>singgang</i>, one of the traditional dishes on the east coast of Malaysia. This is a relevant study confirming the importance of healthy food, but it makes me wonder what the applicability of this study might be, did the authors sought to encourage the consumption of chub mackerel or the dish itself, are there similar studies planned involving other fish species?</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jurgita Sulinskiene
Department, University & Country	Lithuanian University of Health Sciences, Lithuania