

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_127326
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Study on the Proximate and Selected Sugar Composition of Raw and Processed Breadfruit
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> 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>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Review of "Comparative Study on the Proximate and Selected Sugar Composition of Raw and Processed Breadfruit"</p> <p>While the paper does provide some valuable information about the nutritional changes that occur in breadfruit when it's boiled or fried, a closer examination reveals several significant shortcomings that raise concerns about the study's validity and reliability.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Methodology Lacks Essential Details: The methodology section is insufficiently detailed, making it difficult to assess the rigor and reliability of the experimental procedures. For example: Sample Size and Replicates: The authors fail to mention the number of breadfruit samples used and whether the analyses were performed in replicates.^{1,2,3,4} This omission makes it impossible to evaluate the statistical power of the study and determine if the observed differences between raw and processed breadfruit are truly significant. Frying Method: The authors simply state that the breadfruit was "fried for 10 minutes" without specifying the type of oil, the amount of oil used, or the temperature at which the frying was conducted.¹ These factors can significantly influence the absorption of oil, the formation of potentially harmful compounds (like acrylamide), and the overall nutritional profile of the fried breadfruit. Boiling Method: While the boiling time (1 hour) is provided, other important details are missing.¹ The authors don't indicate whether the breadfruit was boiled whole or in pieces, whether the water was salted, or whether the breadfruit was submerged throughout the boiling process. These variations in boiling technique can affect nutrient leaching and water absorption. Limited Scope of Processing Methods and Sugar Analysis: The choice of only two processing methods and the selection of specific sugars for analysis raise questions about the study's comprehensiveness and the generalizability of the findings. Processing Methods: Focusing solely on boiling and frying excludes other common methods of preparing breadfruit in various cultures.⁵ Baking, roasting, steaming, and fermenting breadfruit can produce distinct changes in its nutritional composition and should be considered for a more thorough investigation. Sugar Analysis: The rationale for selecting specific sugars for analysis is unclear.⁴ The authors provide some information on the potential health benefits of glucose and xylose, but they don't explain why other sugars, such as sucrose, maltose, or lactose, were not included in the study. Additionally, they mention the presence of uronic acids without quantifying their concentrations or discussing their potential implications. This selective approach to sugar analysis limits the study's ability to provide a comprehensive understanding of the carbohydrate composition of breadfruit. Discussion Relies on Unsubstantiated Claims and Inconsistent Referencing: The discussion section attempts to contextualize the findings within existing literature but suffers from several flaws. Unclear Comparisons: The authors make vague statements like "The values of the boiled and fried breadfruit carbohydrate content are comparable to those of Ojmelukwe and Ugwuona⁶," without providing specific values or elaborating on the similarities or differences.⁷ Similarly, they claim that "the ash content of the raw breadfruit was close to the study of Tukura and Obliva³," without quantifying this closeness or discussing its significance.⁷ These 	

Review Form 3

	<p>ambiguous comparisons weaken the paper's scientific rigor.</p> <p>10. Incomplete and Inconsistent Referencing: Numerous references mentioned in the discussion are absent from the reference list.⁷⁸ Moreover, the existing references lack consistency in formatting and completeness. This lack of attention to referencing practices raises serious concerns about the paper's academic integrity.</p> <p>In summary, this paper suffers from methodological weaknesses, a limited scope, an incomplete discussion, and referencing errors. These issues significantly undermine the study's scientific validity and its potential contribution to the field.</p> <p>To be considered for publication, the authors must address these shortcomings by:</p> <p>Providing a detailed and transparent description of all experimental procedures, including sample size, replicates, and specific details about the processing methods.</p> <p>Expanding the scope of the study to include other relevant processing methods and providing a rationale for the selection of sugars analyzed.</p>	
--	---	--

PART 2:

	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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Workiyie Getnet Abera
Department, University & Country	Dilla University, Debre Tabor University, Ethiopia