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|  | Reviewer’s comment **Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | **Author’s Feedback** (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.** | **Yes, overall, it is a fascinating and useful article.** **In the following, I will give my opinion on the different sections.** | Thank you for your encouraging words and for considering the article valuable. |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | **It would be better if the title were changed. For instance, the word “Unlocking” can be changed. Of course, It is better to change the title of the article by the author, because the idea is from her/him, and the related articles that he has reviewed can help him/her.** | Revised title: Waste to Wellness: Nutraceutical Innovation through Agri-Waste |
| 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 more like an introduction. I think it's better to explain more about your work after a brief introduction. That is, what your goal was and what results it led to. Also state how this work differs from other similar works.** | I have revised it to make it more concise and focused, ensuring that it clearly presents the objective of the work, key findings, and the novelty of the study after a brief contextual introduction. The revised abstract now highlights how this work differs from existing studies, emphasizing its unique contributions to the field. I trust the updated version aligns better with the journal’s expectations. |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. | **The research background is not used in the "Introduction". Certainly, many studies and researches have been conducted and each of them have obtained results, none of which have been mentioned here. I suggest you use the studies and experiences of other researchers and bring them here. Then tell about your work and mention the difference between your work and other researches and explain the importance of your work.**  **The "Conclusion" is very brief. Although it has been said about the limitations, but the writing should be changed.**  **Altogether, the sentences are appropriate and scientifically a good work has been done.** | The introduction section is revised to include a more detailed discussion of the research background. Several recent studies (e.g., Mirabella et al., 2014; Shahidi & Ambigaipalan, 2015; Zhang et al., 2020; Chemat et al., 2017) are included to highlight key advances and knowledge gaps in the field. This addition sets the context for the current review and delineates how our work offers a comprehensive and integrated perspective that builds upon, yet goes beyond, previous literature. The updated conclusion section is now revised to provide a clearer summary of the review's key themes, including the nutraceutical potential of agri-food waste, technological and environmental aspects, and the relevance to the circular bioeconomy. The section also addresses current challenges and future research directions. |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** | **The references are relatively new. That is, that the number of references after 2020 is low. Also, given the importance and breadth of the topic, the number of references is limited.**  **In addition, as mentioned in the previous section, it is better to add references related to research background.**  **I suggest you also use the studies and experiences of other researchers.**  **Green synthesis of agricultural waste biomass-assisted metal and metal oxide nanostructures and their applications: A review** | Thank you for highlighting this important aspect. In response to your observation, I have significantly expanded the reference list by incorporating a greater number of recent studies published after 2020, ensuring the inclusion of up-to-date research in this evolving field. Additionally, I have added references that provide a stronger background and context for the study, including relevant findings and experiences of other researchers. These updates aim to better reflect the scope and significance of the topic and strengthen the foundation of the manuscript. |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | **Yes, overall, the sentences are appropriate. But it is better to change the type of writing.** | I carefully reviewed the manuscript and revised the writing style to enhance academic tone, clarity, and coherence throughout. |
| Optional/General comments | **The number of** **the figures and tables** **is low. The quality of the figures and tables is not good. There are better figures or diagrams that can be used.** | I have addressed your concerns by increasing the number of figures and tables to better support the content. Additionally, I have improved the visual quality of the existing figures and replaced them where necessary with more relevant and high-resolution diagrams to enhance clarity and presentation. I trust these revisions will strengthen the manuscript. |
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|  | **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?** | *(There are no ethical issues in the manuscript)* | I thank the reviewer for the valuable feedback. I agree with the suggestions and have made the necessary corrections throughout the manuscript. As the changes occur in multiple sections, I am unable to highlight each one individually. However, all revisions have been carefully implemented as per the reviewer’s guidance. |