

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_129108
Title of the Manuscript:	Oilseed Meals An Untapped Resource for Nutritional Innovation
Type of the Article	Original Research 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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The research topic is extremely important as it addresses the use of food waste to enhance the nutritional value of traditional foods. This, in turn, benefits society by reducing malnutrition prevalent in some communities. It is also important as it helps reduce environmental pollution caused by food waste, which negatively affects the health of individuals in the community.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Oilseed Meals: An Untapped Resource for Nutritional Innovation	
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	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	There is no discussion of the results as the current results have not been compared with previous results.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The references in the introduction, results and discussion, and statistical analysis are insufficient. The references are not up to date. The year of the AOAC reference in the study differs from the one in the reference list, and there are two AOAC references in the list despite only one AOAC reference being cited in the study. Reference number 3 in the reference list is not cited in the study. 	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<u>Optional/General</u> 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:	Manal Mohammed El-Sayed Mohammed Shehata
Department, University & Country	Zagazig University, Egypt