

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Biotechnology and Bioresource Technology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJB2T_82311
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation Of The Effects Of Some Metal Chloride On The Initial Reaction Rate Of Crude Peroxidase From Watermelon Peels
Type of the Article	Original research article

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The references in this paper are very old and have little reference value to this paper. Please compare them with those in recent years?</li><li>2. The interpretation of the image conclusion is not clear. It only describes the trend of the image, but does not discuss the principle, such as the root cause of the increase and decrease of Pb ion concentration?</li><li>3. Combined with the discussion part, in my opinion, the overall trend of <math>\text{Fe}^{2+}</math> is better than <math>\text{Pb}^{2+}</math> with higher activity. Why choose <math>\text{Pb}^{2+}</math> and not <math>\text{Fe}^{2+}</math>?</li><li>4. In this paper, the influence of metal ion concentration on the initial reaction rate of crude peroxidase from Watermelon Peels was only considered, without considering the influence of other factors. Such as temperature, humidity, Watermelon Peels, etc.?</li><li>5. Did the participation of Cl ions affect the Initial Reaction Rate of Crude Peroxidase From Watermelon Peels?</li><li>6. The instrument test in this paper is measured by spectrophotometer. There is a high degree of error in the accuracy, please use high-precision instruments such as ICP to cooperate with the measurement to ensure the rigor of the data?</li><li>7. The paper only expounds the data as a whole, and lacks too much theoretical research and almost no theoretical elaboration.</li></ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>8. Why <math>\text{Hg}^{2+}</math>, <math>\text{Na}^+</math>, <math>\text{Pb}^{2+}</math>, <math>\text{Fe}^{2+}</math> ions were selected in this paper, and what was the basis for their selection?</li></ol>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>9. Further improve some details of the article.</li></ol>	

### 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?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>The paper only expounds the data as a whole, and lacks too much theoretical research and almost no theoretical elaboration.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Songjian Zhao
Department, University & Country	Jiangsu University of Technology, China