

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_127292
Title of the Manuscript:	EXPLORING THE POTENTIAL OF CITRUS PEELS: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF AGROINDUSTRIAL WASTE
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>

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. authors must 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.	This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it sheds light on the untapped potential of citrus peels, turning something as simple as waste into valuable resources like nutraceuticals and eco-friendly products. It addresses environmental and health challenges, making the work feel meaningful and timely. The thorough exploration of different citrus species and their properties adds depth and opens doors for practical sustainability and waste management applications. I appreciate the effort put into the study, but making the methods and results clearer and more visually engaging could make it even more impactful and accessible.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Suggested Revision: <i>Exploring the Potential of Citrus Peels: Valorization and Comparative Analysis of Agro-Industrial Waste</i>	
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.	The abstract is informative but could be improved by adding key results, clarifying objectives, and briefly mentioning practical applications. Simplifying complex phrases would make it more engaging and easier to follow.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate, as they logically present the study's background, methods, results, and discussion. However, some sections could benefit from clearer transitions and concise subheadings to improve readability. Additionally, ensuring consistency in the formatting and labeling of figures and tables would enhance the overall structure.	
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.	This manuscript appears to be scientifically robust and technically sound, as it employs established analytical methods such as UV spectrophotometry, DPPH antioxidant assays, and antimicrobial testing, all of which are widely recognized in related research. The experimental design is well-structured, with clear comparisons of various citrus species for their nutritional and bioactive properties. The inclusion of quantitative data, statistical analysis, and relevant controls, such as ampicillin in antimicrobial assays, adds to its scientific credibility. Furthermore, the discussion links the findings to potential applications, emphasizing their relevance for sustainability and resource valorization.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions for additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references in the manuscript are largely sufficient and include relevant and foundational studies to support the research. However, it may benefit from the inclusion of more recent studies (within the last 5 years) that provide updated insights into the nutritional analysis and bioactive properties of citrus species. This would strengthen the manuscript's alignment with current scientific discussions and enhance its credibility. Specific references focusing on the comparative bioactive profiling of underutilized citrus species or the latest advancements in sustainable food processing technologies could be valuable additions.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality of the article is generally suitable for scholarly communication, as it conveys the research clearly and effectively. However, there are minor grammatical issues and instances of repetitive phrasing that could be refined to enhance readability and flow. A thorough review by a professional editor or a native English speaker would be beneficial to ensure consistency and polish the manuscript for publication.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Mohammed N. Salman
Department, University & Country	Jabir Ibn Hayyan Medical University for Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences, Iraq