

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JSRR_121476</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Litchi waste: An important Sources of Health Beneficial</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Review Article</b>

#### **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>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <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 provides an overview of the health benefits associated with litchi waste, focusing on its nutritional value and potential applications. It highlights various valuable components of litchi by-products and their potential health benefits. The review is scientifically robust and technically sound; however, some crucial revisions are needed to improve clarity and coherence.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<b>Current Title:</b> Litchi waste: An important Sources of Health Beneficial <b>Suggested Title:</b> Litchi Waste: An Important Source of Health Benefits	
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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The abstract provides a good overview but could benefit from a brief mention of specific health benefits and the main findings. Adding a sentence summarizing the key insights from the review would enhance the comprehensiveness of the abstract.</li> <li>2. Summarize the key takeaways more succinctly. Highlight how litchi waste could be integrated into practical applications like nutraceuticals or pharmaceuticals as you have mentioned these words in your keywords.</li> <li>3. Consider refining the language for clarity. For example, "Nevertheless, eating it produces a large quantity of waste" could be rephrased to "However, litchi consumption generates significant waste." Clarify the term "litchi trash" to "litchi waste" for consistency and professionalism and so on.</li> <li>4. Emphasize the main findings and implications more clearly. For instance, "This review investigates the nutritional makeup of litchi waste and explores its potential health benefits."</li> </ol>	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure are generally appropriate. However, the manuscript could benefit from a clearer delineation between sections to improve flow and readability.	
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.	Manuscript is scientifically correct and accurate. Examples provided are all well supported by the literature. The analysis is based on a comprehensive review of existing studies, and the conclusions are supported by evidence. The manuscript's thorough examination of various health aspects, including antioxidant and antimicrobial properties, demonstrates its technical soundness.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	The references are generally sufficient, but incorporating additional recent studies on litchi waste and its health benefits would strengthen the review. Consider adding more recent papers to ensure the review covers the latest research. Perhaps in the most recent 2-3 years mostly.	

### Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p><b>The language quality is generally acceptable, but some grammatical errors and many awkward phrasings should be corrected for clarity and readability e.g.,</b>          Multiple mentions of "phenolic compounds" can be consolidated.          if you mention "51–102 g kg<sup>-1</sup> DW," use the same format throughout.          "Litchi seeds have demonstrated a number of pharmacological actions..." could be rephrased to list actions more clearly.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Ensure that complex sentences are broken down for better readability and consistent use of terminology. Some sentences are lengthy and could be more effective if simplified. Avoid using overly technical jargon without definition; aim for a balance between academic rigor and accessibility. Conduct a thorough proofreading session to catch any grammatical or typographical errors.</b></li> <li>2. <b>Double-check all references for accuracy and completeness. Ensure consistency in your citation style throughout the article. Depending on the journal's requirements, you might need to adhere to specific formatting rules. Consider using a reference management tool to streamline your citations and bibliography.</b></li> <li>3. <b>The structure of your sections is logical, but consider adding subheadings, if possible, within sections to guide the reader more clearly through different aspects of litchi waste and its health benefits.</b></li> <li>4. <b>Where possible, include visual aids to help summarize complex information and make the review more engaging.</b></li> </ol>	

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

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Muhammad Ateeb
Department, University & Country	The University of Haripur, Pakistan