

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_109825
Title of the Manuscript:	OPTIMIZATION OF LOW CALORIE FUNCTIONAL SHRIKHAND WITH NATURAL SWEETENERS, FRUIT PULP AND FRUIT PEEL EXTRACT
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Indeed, this manuscript holds significance for the scientific community since it aims to create an optimal low-calorie functional shrikhand by combining guava pulp, dragon fruit peel extract, and natural sweeteners like stevia and liquorice extracts. A traditional dairy product from India, srikhand typically contains a lot of sugar and fat.</p> <p>No changes are needed to the existing title as it appropriately reflects the research work carried out.</p> <p>The abstract stays within the word limit while providing all the essential information, such as the goals, methodology, findings, and conclusion, in a clear and concise manner. It provides a thorough summary of the entire research project for the reader. There is nothing more that needs to be mentioned. Therefore, it can be said that the provided abstract is comprehensive.</p> <p>. The introduction does not contain subheadings to segregate different topics like background on shrikhand, need for the study, brief on natural sweeteners etc. This could make it lengthy to read.</p> <p>.In materials and methods, the subsections on raw material selection and extract preparation lack details on quantities used, conditions, etc. making them difficult to replicate exactly.</p> <p>.Results are well presented but could have additional subsections to separately discuss the effect of different variables (sweeteners, guava, peel extract) tested for better flow.</p> <p>.Discussion compares to very few other published studies though more are cited. Broader comparison would strengthen outcomes.</p> <p>.Conclusion does not discuss limitations and scope for future work which is common for such applied research papers.</p> <p>Without access to the original data, methods could not be fully verified. Some aspects like sample size are also not clearly described. More details on validation of analytical methods would strengthen scientific rigor.</p> <p>Overall, on the basis of information presented, the approach, analyses and interpretation of results seem appropriately aligned with scientific standards for a product optimization study. With some methodological clarifications, the manuscript appears.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some of the background references like on shrikhand composition are from 1991 and 2011 which can be updated. • Only 1-2 references used for discussing properties of each natural extract (stevia, liquorice etc.), more can be added. • Very few references used for comparing sensory evaluation methodology though it is well established. • References for statistical analyses are not cited. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>For the most part, grammar and sentence construction appear to be correct without any glaring errors.</p> <p>Some technical terms related to experimental procedures are not fully defined on first use (e.g. sample size for sensory testing)</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Optional/General comments	Limited sample size compromising repeatability and validity. Convenience or biased sampling as opposed to randomization. Insufficient blinding or controls in subjective assessments. Disregard for confounding factors and their effects. Experiments were not repeated enough to ensure reliability. Improper or unvalidated selection of analytical methods. Infractions of research ethics in certain investigations. Writing errors include poor grammar and structure. Failing to establish a connection between structure and activity. Unsupported conclusions that go beyond the scope of the work. Lack of peer review reduces the validity of the results.	
----------------------------------	---	--

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mustafa Riyadh Mohammed
Department, University & Country	University of Anbar, Iraq