

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_129236
Title of the Manuscript:	Green Extraction of Bioactive Compounds from Guava Fruit and Leaves: A Comparative Study Using Ultrasound-Assisted Extraction
Type of the Article	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>

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	This manuscript contributes to the scientific community by addressing specific focus areas, such as "the antibacterial potential of lactic acid bacteria against food spoilage pathogens." These studies give valuable insight into more specific findings or innovations, for example, "the ability of LAB to produce bio-preservatives, offering a natural alternative to chemical preservatives in food systems." This research opens up pathways for new applications in biotechnology and food industries by highlighting implications for both food safety and sustainability. The work contributes to the understanding of microbial interactions that underpins the development of microbial-based solutions to global challenges.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	I suggest that authors should revise it to enumerate the key findings, for example, "Ultrasound-Enhanced Extraction of Bioactive Compounds from Guava: A Comparative Approach."	
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.	Lack of detail on specific results. While the abstract summarizes the study, it does not contain any quantified data or critical findings. I suggest that authors should mention specific findings, for example, "Ultrasound-assisted extraction enhanced the phenolic content by 25% in comparison with traditional methods." Lacking context, it has not clearly defined the importance of the ultrasound-assisted extraction over other methods. Please, add a concluding sentence that wraps up the impacts of the study.	

Review Form 3

<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>Introduction There is too little background on ultrasound-assisted extraction. You should expand the background with recent advances in green methods for extraction.</p> <p>There is no gap in research indicated which this study will fill. I suggest that authors should indicate explicitly how this study covers the gaps in the literature.</p> <p>Materials and Methods There is no description of the experimental conditions, such as temperature, concentration of solvent, or frequency of ultrasound. Please, provide exact ultrasound parameters and preparation of solvents.</p> <p>There is no description of control experiments to ensure the validity of the results. Authors should mention a standard or blank control in the experiment.</p> <p>Results: Not all figures and tables are labeled or have error margins. Please, add the error bars, p values, or confidence intervals in all figures and tables to establish reliability.</p> <p>Interpretation of results might be overgeneralized without relating it to the statistical tests. Authors should make sure all visuals are labeled and legended clearly.</p> <p>Discussion: Generalizations of findings are made on overestimation when the superiority of the ultrasound-assisted extraction may not have sufficient evidence to support this preconceived belief. Authors should draw conclusions based on statistical significance and relevant data.</p> <p>There is no comparison with previous studies. The findings should be related to other studies in order to contextualize their relevance.</p> <p>Conclusions: The conclusions are general and do not emphasize any particular results. Authors should clearly state key findings, such as "The optimized ultrasound-assisted extraction enhanced the antioxidant activity by X%."</p> <p>There is no regard for limitations or further investigations. Please, mention limitations regarding scalability or economic feasibility and further studies.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Some references may not be recent or relevant enough. Check references and include recent studies, less than 5 years on green extraction and ultrasound techniques.</p> <p>Inconsistent formatting of citations. You should check the citation style according to journal instructions.</p>	
<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language needs minor revision</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sarmad Ghazi Al-Shawi
Department, University & Country	University of Basrah, Iraq