

Review Form 1.8

S

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JABB_120097 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Determination of Polyphenols, Reducing Potential and FT-IR Analysis of Green Tea (Camellia sinensis L.) Leaves Extract for Nanoparticles Synthesis |
| Type of the 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://journaljabb.com/index.php/JABB/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.8

PART 1: Review Comments

| Compulsory REVISION comments | Reviewer's comment | Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i> |
|--|---|---|
| Is the manuscript important for scientific community? <i>(Please write few sentences regarding this manuscript to justify your answer)</i> | Yes, it can be important for scientific community. Actually, a lot of studies have been done on green tea, but of course, the study can contribute to science with the hope that different results may be obtained. | |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | Yes, it is suitable. | |
| Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? | Yes, the abstract is comprehensive. | |
| Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? | Yes, subsections and structure of the manuscript is appropriate. | |
| Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? <i>(Please write few sentences regarding this manuscript to justify your answer)</i> | Yes, I think the manuscript is scientifically correct. As I said before, the antioxidant and other effects of green tea had been widely studied. But every study is valuable and can contribute to the literature. Of course, including this study. | |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. | Only 4 of the 46 references contain very new references. It does around 8 percent. Not bad, but there could have been more recent references. | |
| Minor REVISION comments | | |
| Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | Yes, it is suitable. | |
| Optional/General comments | <p>It is important: There are some deficiencies in FTIR analysis method and interpretation.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) What are background scans, analysis scans, resolution measurements? 2) Device results are given directly. I see that baseline and noise removal are not done, and even if they are done, they are insufficient. Therefore, many peak values may have been missed. These must be important to you. If it is unimportant, I do not recommend putting these FTIR results with this data in this article. 3) Things to do: I recommend that you draw your own FTIR graph with the .dpt files from the device, extract the peak values, perform operations such as baseline correction, noise removal and taking second derivatives. If you can't do it, I don't recommend you to put it as the first result it came out of the device. | |

[Review Form 1.8](#)

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> | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Name: | Eda Altinöz |
| Department, University & Country | Kastamonu University, Turkey |