

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.	The manuscript describes coconut inflorescence powder using CRD- Completely randomized design method. It is different and distinct in methodology as there are just a few articles the authors of which use statistics methods correctly and completely. From this point, it is very important to the scientific community.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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, I think it would be even better to add a sentence describing also the lowest mean rank value, as the manuscript contains much data, many figures, it is better to show more of them in the abstract. I provided a sample sentence in the place where I think it could be more appropriate, please enter the other figures.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, very good.	
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.	It sounds as as I told above it contains a very useful and powerful statistics method for the investigation – CRD. The authors thoroughly described how they did the research.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	yes	
Minor REVISION comments	yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
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:	Yuliya V.Preobrazhenskaya
Department, University & Country	International Sakharov Environmental Institute, Belarus