

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_CJAST_104811</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>FORMULATION AND STANDARDIZATION OF GUJARATI SNACK (KHAKHRA) FORTIFIED WITH WHOLE UNRIPE PUMPKIN (CUCURBITA MOSCHATA) POWDER</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research 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.journalcjast.com/index.php/CJAST/editorial-policy> )

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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</b> REVISION 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? 5.</b>  <b>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>  <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	<b>1. The study can provide alternative snack which is more nutritious as compared to the common readily available snacks in the market.</b> <b>2. The title of the study is suitable.</b> <b>3. The abstract is not comprehensive. Salient results of the study should be included. 4. The subsections are appropriate as well as the structure. However, thorough discussion and implications of the results should be provided.</b> <b>5. The manuscript is scientifically sound as to the procedure conducted. 6. The references needs to include updated journals preferably from 2018 the latest.</b>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes, the manuscript was written in a scholarly manner. However, the discussion needs to be more thorough.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Danilet Vi M. Mendoza</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>College of Arts and Sciences, Nueva Ecija University of Science and Technology, Philippines</b>