

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_123413
Title of the Manuscript:	Profiling nutrient composition and antioxidant potential of rambutan (<i>Nephelium lappaceum</i> L) peel
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

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>
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.	The manuscript is engaging and well-written but requires additional discussion on the findings to enhance its depth and clarity.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, it is.	
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.	Yes, I believe it is comprehensive and suitable for the manuscript.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, it is appropriate, but the flow of the results and discussion should be improved by introducing the content before presenting the tables and/or figures. This will provide context and help readers better understand the data and its significance.	
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.	The manuscript lacks scientific robustness as it focuses primarily on fundamental knowledge and employs basic techniques for determining the nutritional profile, phytochemical screening, and antioxidant activity of rambutan peel. Additionally, it does not propose any industrial applications or potential advancements for future research.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, the references are sufficient, but it would be beneficial to include more recent citations from the last 5 to 10 years, particularly for methods. Exceptions can be made for well-established protocols, such as AOAC (2000), which remain relevant and widely accepted in the field.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, it should be suitable, but please ensure consistent use of either English (US) or English (UK) throughout the manuscript. Currently, there is a mix of both, which should be standardized.	
Optional/General comments	<p>In general, the manuscript is well-written and engaging, but there are several areas that need improvement. The manuscript lacks consistency in the use of English (US) versus English (UK) and has formatting issues, such as presenting tables and figures without prior text context. Additionally, there is redundancy in the information, with findings repeated in both the text and tables or figures. Tables should be consolidated for similar parameters comparing fresh and dried rambutan peels. Methodologies should be updated to reflect recent protocols, rather than relying on outdated references. The results and discussion sections need to compare findings with previous studies using the same sample type, rather than comparing with different samples like “commercial grape seed extracts.” The type of statistical tests used is not specified, and the discussion of findings is minimal. The manuscript also lacks suggestions for future research, acknowledgment of financial support, and disclosure of conflicts of interest.</p> <p>I don't believe there are any ethical issues with this manuscript, as it does not involve sensory evaluation, human, or animal studies.</p>	

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:	Mohd Nazri bin Abdul Rahman
Department, University & Country	Universiti Malaysia Sabah, Malaysia