

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Biochemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRB_91500
Title of the Manuscript:	Purification of β -Glucosidase, one of the flavor-enhancing food enzymes, from Peppermint (<i>Mentha piperita</i> L.) and its Biochemical Characterization
Type of the Article	Original Research 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:

(<https://journalajrb.com/index.php/AJRB/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		
Minor REVISION comments	I have just reviewed this manuscript. In this work, the researchers investigated the purification of β-Glucosidase, one of the flavor-enhancing food enzymes, from Peppermint. The manuscript is well-written, and the results presented here may be useful in several fields, such as biotechnology and food industry. I have only minor comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Indicate if standard deviations or confidence intervals are used in the plots.- Replot the figures 5 and 6 with the y-axis being at the left of the plot (rescale it from the minimum x-axis value to the maximum).- Conclusion has to be modified as it includes introductory information (the first paragraph), which should have been in the introduction section. Please rewrite.	1. Standard deviations were used in the graphs in Figures 5 and 6. In the calculation of K_i values, it is indicated as \pm value in the Results section. 2. Figures 5 and 6 graphics: I want to thank the reviewer for his suggestion to improve the figures in the article. However, I will not be able to make this change in a short time. I also evaluated that this requested proposal was not inaccurate or lacking in information. I see no harm in printing the figures as they are. 3. Upon the reviewer's suggestion, the first paragraph of the conclusion was written in the Introduction section. Both sections have been rearranged. 4. References have been rearranged due to the changes made.
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	