

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_127178
Title of the Manuscript:	Dyeing of Textiles with Eco-Friendly Natural Dyes: A Comprehensive Review
Type of the Article	REVIEW 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. 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.	It gives a detailed explanation on the use of natural dyes and their environmental importance The information given is sufficient although missing is the methodology of how the data was collected Also missing is the dates the information was collected, the source of the information i.e internet, google scholar. repositories, the search criteria etc Also missing is the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the selected literature cited (The author should confer with other review papers on how this is done)	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	its suitable and sufficient although based on the length and nature of information provided, this paper fits more as a mini review	
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 short and may need additional information to make more sense.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	YES. Author to include Methodology	
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 document is fairly robust and scientifically correct. The explanations are clear More recent citations would make the work better	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	the references are fair, an updated one incorporating more recent ones would be better although not a must	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Fairly Suitable	
Optional/General comments	major revisions should be done before the document is accepted for publication with major reviews on methodologies employed, criteria for searches, inclusion and exclusion criteria	

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:	Mark Peter Odera
Department, University & Country	The Eldoret National Polytechnic, Kenya