

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_131215
Title of the Manuscript:	Nutritional Potential of Watermelon (Citrullus lanatus (Thunb.) Matsum. & Nakai) Genotypes with Different Flesh Colours
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.	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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This study is important as it highlights the nutritional diversity of watermelon genotypes with different flesh colors. Red-fleshed watermelons are rich in lycopene and ascorbic acid, while orange-fleshed ones have the highest beta-carotene content, and yellow-orange varieties contain the most citrulline. These findings can support the development of nutritionally enhanced watermelon cultivars and help consumers make informed dietary choices.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title is suitable as it clearly reflects the study's focus on the nutritional potential of different watermelon genotypes based on their flesh color variations. It accurately conveys the research scope and key aspects, making it relevant and informative for the scientific community.	
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 well-written and effectively summarizes the study's objectives, methodology, key findings, and significance. It clearly presents the variation in nutritional components among different watermelon genotypes. Minor improvements, such as refining statistical details and enhancing the conclusion, could further strengthen its clarity and impact. Overall, it provides a comprehensive and informative overview of the research.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically correct and includes all essential components of a research article. It clearly presents the research objective, methodology, results, and conclusions in a structured manner. The statistical analysis supports the findings, and the discussion aligns with the study's objectives. Minor refinements in data presentation and clarity could enhance readability, but overall, the manuscript meets the standards of scientific research.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and appropriately support the study. They provide relevant and credible sources that align with the research topic. Ensuring that the references include the most recent studies will further strengthen the manuscript. However, overall, the citations are comprehensive and well-integrated into the research.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Very Good	
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:	Theeranat Suwanaruang
Department, University & Country	Faculty of Science and Health Technology Kalasin University, Thailand