

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	Research

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 <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	In respect to physico-chemical properties of Probiotic Shrikhand prepared with utilization of Arrowroot powder showed decreases in Protein, Fat and Titrable acidity. with increase in level of Arrowroot powder. While Total solid and Ash was increases with increase in level of Arrowroot powder.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Suitable but the last letter can be changed to properties	
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.	Yes, its comprehensive	
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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	More references need to be incorporated and the title should be References not Literature Cited:	
Minor REVISION comments	Yes suitable	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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:	Vidhya C.S
Department, University & Country	NIFTEM – Thanjavur, India