

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_123910
Title of the Manuscript:	Optimization of Green Tea Catechin Loaded Niosomes by Thin Film Hydration Technique using Food Grade Surfactants
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is of significant importance to the scientific community, especially in the fields of nanotechnology, but also for the development of functional foods. It provides a comprehensive investigation on the formulation optimization of catechin-loaded niosomes, which can improve the bioavailability and stability of bioactive compounds. The detailed exploration of various surfactants, stabilizers and preparation techniques provides valuable information for researchers working on encapsulation methods. I appreciate the systematic approach of the manuscript and the clear presentation of the results.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title seems clear and descriptive to me.	
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 clear and provides an overview of the study, including the methods used and the results obtained.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are quite adequate, and the logical progression of ideas follows a coherent and reasonable flow. Each section is dedicated to certain parts of the study, and the orderly subheadings make the content seem easier to understand. Some of the positives are as follows: Materials and Methods: It clearly explains the methods of execution of the studies, with all the detailed parameters indicated in the paper. Results and Discussion: Good structure with dedicated subsections addressing the results in the context of each variable tested. Conclusion: provides a summary of the main points and results obtained in the paper.	
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's thorough approach to optimizing the synthesis of catechin-loaded niosomes makes it appear technically and scientifically sound. It provides clear experimental data on particle size, polydispersity index, Zeta potential and encapsulation efficiency and methodically examines important parameters including homogenization speed, types of stabilizers and polydispersity index for optimization. The accuracy and reliability of the results are ensured by the characterization process using well-established techniques such as scanning electron microscopy (SEM) and dynamic light scattering (DLS). Additionally, by using ANOVA as a statistical analysis, the study gains scientific credibility by strengthening the validity of the conclusions.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, the references are sufficient and recent.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English quality of the article is generally suitable for scholarly communication.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Review Form 3

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:	Mirela Anamaria Jimborean
Department, University & Country	University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine, Romania