



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

|                          |                                                                                                                 |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">International Journal of Biochemistry Research &amp; Review</a>                                     |
| Manuscript Number:       | 2014_IJBcRR_13188                                                                                               |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Characterization of Dipeptidyl Peptidase IV Enzyme Activity in Serum of the Komodo Dragon (Varanus komodoensis) |
| 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

|                                            | 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>                                                                                                          |
|--------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments | 1. The conclusions section is not proper. There should be no references in conclusion section. You need to answer the question raised in the aim of the study. | 1) The authors disagree with this, as it is opinion rather than fact. Many peer-reviewed papers site references in the conclusion. In addition, the SDI instructions on state "This should briefly state the major findings of the study", and says nothing about the inclusion of references |
| <b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments      | 1. Do not use abbreviations like min. or hrs. in the abstract.                                                                                                 | 1) The abbreviations have been removed from the abstract                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| <b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments    | Delete useless abbreviations.                                                                                                                                  | 1) This is a very general comment, and it is impossible for us to determine which abbreviations that this reviewer deems "useless"                                                                                                                                                            |