

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_126116
Title of the Manuscript:	To Study the utilization of Arrowroot Powder (Maranta arundinacea L.) in the Preparation of Probiotic Shrikhand and their physico-chemical quality
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

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 offers valuable insights into improving a traditional Indian dairy product, Shrikhand, with enhanced nutritional and health benefits by incorporating probiotics and arrowroot powder. Its focus on probiotics aligns with current scientific interest in functional foods that provide benefits beyond basic nutrition, supporting gut health, immune function, and cholesterol reduction. Furthermore, the study's use of arrowroot as a natural thickener that maintains the sensory quality of Shrikhand could have practical applications in the food industry. I appreciate this manuscript's innovative approach to enhancing food, combining traditional dietary practices with modern health science.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Enhancing Probiotic Shrikhand: Utilization of Arrowroot Powder and Its Impact on Physico-Chemical Qualities	
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.	Suggested revision: This study investigated the use of arrowroot powder (<i>Maranta arundinacea</i> L.) in enhancing the nutritional and sensory qualities of probiotic Shrikhand, a traditional Indian dairy product. Shrikhand was prepared from buffalo milk with 5%, 7.5%, and 10% arrowroot powder, 70% sugar and <i>Lactobacillus casei</i> as the probiotic culture. Results showed that incorporating 5% arrowroot powder yielded the best balance of texture, flavor, and probiotic viability, suggesting that arrowroot powder can enhance the nutritional and sensory profile of probiotic Shrikhand. This study provides a promising approach for functional dairy products with added health benefits	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	yes	
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.	This manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness by adhering to established methodologies, such as using standardized methods (e.g., gravimetric, Gerber, and micro-Kjeldahl methods) to ensure accuracy in chemical analysis. The study employs <i>Lactobacillus casei</i> , a well-researched probiotic strain, providing a reliable basis for assessing probiotic benefits. By testing multiple concentrations of arrowroot powder, the research captures variations in texture and nutritional enhancement, which adds depth to the findings. Overall, the study is technically sound, with a clear experimental design, precise measurements, and relevance to both nutritional science and traditional food enhancement.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	yes	
Minor REVISION comments	yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General 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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mehvish Ayoub
Department, University & Country	Sher-e-Kashmir University of Agricultural science and Technology Shalimar, India