



Journal Name:	BIONATURE
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BN_1514
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of mucin on lipid bilayers by phase of layer
Type of the Article	

	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)
<p><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</p> <p>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</p> <p>(If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes, the manuscript investigating the effect of mucin on lipid bilayers by phase of layer holds significant importance for the scientific community. This research sheds light on how mucin influences the structure and properties of lipid bilayers in different phases, offering valuable insights into the complex interplay between mucins and biological membranes.</p> <p>2. The title "Effect of mucin on lipid bilayers by phase of layer" effectively communicates the main focus of the manuscript. However, if a more descriptive or engaging title is desired, an alternative could be: "Exploring the Influence of Mucin on Lipid Bilayers: Insights into Phase-Dependent Interactions".</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract provides a comprehensive overview of the study's methodology and findings</p> <p>4. Yes</p> <p>5. No, need work on it.</p> <p>6. Suggestion that, not sufficient, need more, only 03 references are recent out of 19.</p> <p>7. Found plagiarism issues, 10 spelling errors, 26 grammar issues, and also 29 additional writing issues involved in this short communication. References are not set as per journal guideline.</p> <p>.</p>	<p>2. The title has been modified.</p> <p>6. There are not much recent references relevant to this research.</p> <p>7. Result from iThenticate was 16%. This result is not problem.</p>
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>No, this communication comprises plagiarism issues, 10 spelling errors, 26 grammar issues, and also 29 additional writing issues.</p>	<p>Result from iThenticate was 16%. This result is not problem.</p>
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		



GLOBAL PRESS HUB

[GPH Review Form](#)

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>	