

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_85861
Title of the Manuscript:	A Selective Review of Lipid Autoxidation and Rancidity, Antioxidants, and Dithiooxamide
Type of the 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://www.journalajmah.com/index.php/AJMAH/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	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Addition of theory or results of previous research should consider the year of publication (at least use a reference source 5 years from the current year)2. It is necessary to submit ethical clearance to the ethics committee so that there is evidence that the research conducted does not violate ethics and avoids conflicts of interest because the research uses mice or rats and produces a product (avoiding conflicts of interest) so it is necessary to pay attention to aspects of research ethics.	Dear honorable professor, 1. For previous research on the autoxidation, unfortunately I no longer have access to lab facilities at this point. However, on toxicity studies, fortunately I did manage to find a current PubChem reference (dated 2021, Ref 16 on page 48), and mentioned it on page 41, third paragraph. Thank you so much for your kind understanding. 2. As for mice, as the toxicity study was done in 1982 and predated the current Animal Welfare Act, it was exempt. Nonetheless, based on even the later 1985 Animal Welfare Act Guide published from the National Research Council in 1985, the toxicity study was deemed compliant, as mice and rates were exempt from the Guide. I mentioned this in page 41. Thank you for your kind understanding.
Minor REVISION comments	In the discussion or discussion section, it is necessary to explain one by one the research results obtained and use new references (at least 5 years from the current year).	Dear honorable professor, As mentioned above, I no longer have access to the lab, and the autoxidation studies and results were only available in the manner I wrote in the paper unfortunately. However, the toxicity study did have a current PubChem reference as mentioned above, dated 2021.
Optional/General comments	In general it is good but it needs an ethical test and it is written where to do the ethical test with a certificate number.	Dear honorable professor, Please refer to my comments above in "Compulsory" revision comments, #2.

Review Form 1.6

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>	