

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JSRR_101198</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Edible Coating of Jackfruit Bulbs – A Review</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Minireview Article</b>

### General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/editorial-policy> )

### PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments  <b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  <b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>  <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	<b>1. Yes scientific quality of work is significant as edible coatings serve as edible packaging and environmentally friendly so help to replace or reduce the utilization of synthetic packaging</b> <b>2. Rewrite with more attractive words as title is very causal and common</b>  <b>3. How is author confident by saying it is the best postharvest treatment for preservation of Jackfruit while in discussion edible coating with low temperature extend the better shelf life so it's my suggestion kindly modify abstract and add new information in abstract.</b> <b>4. Improve language expression.</b>  <b>5. Yes, but include concise description of all parameters with reason in 3.1,3.2,3.3 and 3.3 The discussion data need more information.</b> <b>6. Yes</b>	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments  <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Accepted with Minor Revision	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ammara Ainee</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Institute of Food Science and Nutrition, University of Sargodha, Pakistan</b>