Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JABB_130422**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Investigations on methods of drying and storage on anthocyanin content and anti-oxidant potential of hibiscus tea infusions**
Type of the Article	

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 study provides valuable insights into how different drying methods influence the retention of bioactive compounds in hibiscus petals. Its findings contribute to the growing body of research on natural food colorants and health-focused beverages. The outcomes are particularly relevant to industries. In other word, the focus of this study is well explained; however, the problem statement could be further elaborated by linking it to gaps in the existing literature or specific challenges the study aims to address.	
Is the title of the article suitable? **(If not please suggest an alternative title)**	Refine the title to make it more concise and impactful. A recommended alternative title: "Effects of Drying and Storage on Anthocyanin Content and Antioxidant Activity in Hibiscus Tea Infusions".	
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.	Enhance the abstract by including detailed findings and emphasizing the study's broader relevance. 1. Highlight the specific research gap addressed by the study. 2. Include numerical results to emphasize key findings, such as the antioxidant activity and anthocyanin retention across drying methods. 3. Conclude with a statement that underscores the broader applications of the findings, especially for commercial or industrial use.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	To enhance transparency, it would be helpful to expand on the statistical methods used and provide detailed error margins for reported results.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Out of 26 references, 4 references (or 15.38%) are from the last 5 years (2020–2025). The study could be improved by prioritizing references published in the last five years to ensure data relevance and accuracy.	

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Proofread thoroughly to improve grammar, structure, and flow. Technical terminology is used effectively, but some sections could be simplified to ensure broader accessibility to a diverse audience.	
Optional/General comments	The problem statement could be more clearly detailed by elaborating on the challenges or gaps in previous studies. The sampling method aligns with the study's focus. However, the study does not specify whether the sampling process was conducted randomly or systematically to avoid bias. Provide additional details about reliability and validity testing for sensory evaluation, such as statistical analysis of inter-rater reliability.	

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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Siti Nur Fathiha Binti Abdullah**
Department, University & Country	**Kementerian Pendidikan Tinggi, Malaysia**