

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Biochemistry</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRB_79964
Title of the Manuscript:	EXTRACTION AND PARTIAL PURIFICATION OF THAUMATIN FROM Arils of Thaumatooccus daniellii FRUIT.
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>The keywords are to be reviewed</b></p> <p><b>Intrduction:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Develop the study of the effect of thaumatin on diabetes</li><li>- In the introduction it is necessary to add the use of enzymes to eliminate the gel.</li><li>- Are there several types of thaumatin?</li><li>- Discuss the use of genetic engineering</li><li>- Protein crystallization studies.</li></ul> <p><b>Materials and Methods</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Maybe we need to, present photos of the plant and fruits.</li><li>- Forty portions or four portions.</li><li>- Usefulness and nature of salt (why NaCl?)</li></ul> <p><b>RESULT AND DISCUSSION</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-Table 1: at 80 °C and pH 3.0: X=98.00 or 9.80?</li><li>-figure 4.7 or figure 1?</li><li>-Table 4.1 or table 1</li><li>-In paragraph 3.2: The calculated values for protein in distilled water or in Dilute Sodium Chloride?</li><li>-The presence of NaCl increases the extraction of thaumatin, have tested other salts?</li><li>- There is no discussion in paragraph 3.3: the author explained the method and not the result.</li><li>- Bibliographic research is very limited!</li></ul>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Ok</p> <p>Done revision</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p>
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

[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>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>