

# Review of: "Insights into the development of zymography from inception to current day - a discussion on innovations, challenges and solutions"

Carmen Zaharia<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Technical University of Iasi

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

**Journal Name: Qeios ID: X0IB4R · <https://doi.org/10.32388/X0IB4R>**

**Article type: Research Article**

**Author: Soham Jorapur**

**Reviewing Report**

**Dear Editor,**

The subject of this manuscript is current and of increasing interest, especially in biochemical analysis techniques. The author of this manuscript tried to summarize a short development description and evolution in time of this analysis technique – zymography, which is used especially in the semi-quantitative detection of proteases and other hydrolases following their electrophoretic separation in gel matrices.

I carefully read the manuscript, and I must conclude that I like it because it is logical, presented in a simple and clear manner with enough pertinent information. I can accept this manuscript, but after a serious English spelling and grammar check and a few corrections, especially linked with the mentioning style in the text of different researchers' findings.

E.g., before each reference in the text mentioned in brackets, the researcher names must be mentioned firstly, and after the reference in brackets as (i) page 6 – 'Lantz and Ciborowski (Lantz & Ciborowski, 1994)...' or in section 3 – 'This method initiated by Choi and collaborators (Choi et al., 2009)...'; (ii) page 7 – 'Fredricks and Mook (Fredricks & Mook, ...)' or 'Lantz and Ciborowski (... , year)' or Dutta and Bhattacharyya (... ,...) or Hattori 9..., 2002)...".

Also, there must be a definition of what the abbreviations mean, and after, use them. What does FITC mean? or others!!!

Moreover, if wanted, the manuscript can be improved by mentioning reported applications in a table with results, optimal operating conditions, equipment used, information on the analysis accuracy, and reporting references.

I rated the manuscript as follows:

<i>Issues / Rate as:</i>	<i>Excellent</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>N/A</i>
<i>Originality</i>		x			
<i>Brevity and focus</i>			x		
<i>Evaluation of analyses</i>			x		
<i>Interpretation of results</i>			x		
<i>Writing style</i>			x		
<i>Ethical Considerations</i>		x			
<i>References</i>		x			
<i>Accuracy</i>		x			
<i>Language</i>		x			

***Comments to the Editorial Office (Confidential)***

Thank you for the invitation letter to review this manuscript with a challenging and actual subject. I like the manuscript, which is well scientifically written and can be accepted after an additional English spelling and grammar check, and revision considering my comments and recommendations for the author.

Have a good day, and all the best to you and your team!

Manuscript Reviewer

***Recommendations: Accept after minor corrections***