



SDI Review Form 1.5

PART A:

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/IJBcRR/1562
Title of the Manuscript:	<i>Phytochemical screening and biological activities of Hypotrigona squamuligera raw honey.</i>
Manuscript received on (Date)	
Review comment submitted (Date)	



SDI Review Form 1.5

PART B: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part and write here 'Corrected'/ if not agreed, give suitable justifications)
General comment:	The manuscript deals with an interesting study, namely the composition and biological activities of <i>Hypotrigena squamuligera</i> honey. I am afraid, however, that scientific content is poor and insufficient. In addition, the paper is flawed with problems of conductance and presentation.	
Specific comments:		
Title and abstract		
Introduction		
Review of literature (Heading may differ in the case of review paper)		
Materials & methods (Heading may differ in the case of review paper)	"Material" section is virtually absent. Since it is a particular type of honey, it should be better characterized. Since phytochemical composition of honey depends on the flowers and season, it may be different if different batches are taken. "Methods" section should be best detailed by specifying the changes made to tests reported by Safora (1994). "Extraction method" is not sufficiently reported. "Determination of antioxidant activity" lacks adequate references (i.e.: Brand-Williams W, Cuvelier ME, Berset C. Use of a free radical method to evaluate antioxidant activity. Lebenson Wiss Technol 1995;28:25-30. Mensor LL, Menezes FS, Leitao GG, Reis AS, dos Santos TC, Coube CS, et al.. Screening of Brazilian plant extracts for antioxidant activity by the use of DPPH free radical method. Phytother Res 2001;15:127-130). In "Antibacterial activity determination" does not show the bacterial inoculum density (CFU/ml). I am not expert in Microbiology, but the	



SDI Review Form 1.5

	procedure is outdated. No statistical analysis.	
Results & discussion (Heading may differ in the case of review paper)	The results deserve more attention and must be supported by more detailed data (Table 1 is very poor). Discussion is very poor.	
Conclusion		
References		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer