

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JABB_126650 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Protocol refinement for the development of coconut inflorescence powder |
| 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: 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. | Coconut inflorescence positively contributes as a nutraceutical due to its agffluent composition of bioactive compounds, including vitamins, minerals, and antioxidants. Its extended use, beyond just ordinary food, e.g., in promoting health and preventing diseases, has made it a valuable ingredient in both traditional medicine and modern functional foods. This protocol refinement for the development of coconut inflorescence powder with acceptable moisture content and superior sensory quality showed to be an useful methods for the effort to make it a better food component | No corrections are mentioned in this part. Thank you for your valuable comment. |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | Yes it is | No corrections are mentioned in this part. Thank you for your valuable comment. |
| 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. | To enhance focus, consider adding a brief overview in the introduction and summarizing key points at the end of major sections. | Thank you for your valuable comment. A brief overview is added in the Result section before subheadings on page no.3. I agree with your comment. In this section itself, a paragraph summarising the key points is already mentioned on page no. 6 (paragraph just above Table.2). In the discussion part, a paragraph describing the key points is also mentioned (page no. 9). |
| Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? | Yes | No corrections are mentioned in this part. Thank you for your valuable comment. |
| 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 manuscript presents a comprehensive original article of protocol refinement for the development of coconut inflorescence powder with acceptable moisture content and superior sensory quality. It revealed a new approach which showed to be an useful methods for the effort to make it a better food component.The manuscript is technically sound and contributes valuable insights into food processing. It is scientifically robust due to its effort to standardized protocol for the development of CIDS and improving its physical and sensory quality. | No corrections are mentioned in this part. Thank you for your valuable comment. |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. - | Yes | No corrections are mentioned in this part. Thank you for your valuable comment. |
| Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | Yes | No corrections are mentioned in this part. Thank you for your valuable comment. |
| 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> | The declaration that no generative AI technologies have been used is highlighted in the manuscript. |