

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biochemistry, Genetics and Molecular Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJBGMB_125859
Title of the Manuscript:	DETERMINATION OF THE BIOCHEMICAL COMPOSITIONS OF STORED EXPRESSED HUMAN BREAST MILK OF HEALTHY LACTATING MOTHERS.
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 '**l a c k o f N o v e l t y**', 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: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript offers valuable information and analysis that provides important data regarding breast milk	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is appropriate to the subject matter and data addressed	Okay. Well noted
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your	It is suggested to include the word references y instead of literature	Thank you. The word has been changed.
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure and form of the manuscript is adequate and allows a reading and understanding of the article	Thank you.
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	In the methodology section, Two methods of data collection were adopted are mentioned, but they are not clearly described.	Well noted and already incorporated
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	The references are scarce and some are old	I tried updating my references to prevent this challenge. Notwithstanding, I will look into working on my references. Thank you for the thorough review you conducted despite your very busy schedules.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The writing of the manuscript is good and the English is at a good level.	Thank you, dearly.
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	