

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_127915
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluating the Impact of Compound Milk Chocolate Enrobing on Butter Cookies: A Physicochemical and Sensory Assessment
Type of the Article	Original

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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The study is contributing to the scientific community by developing a new food product through chocolate enrobing and educating the audience on how they can explore different options on home-made cookies. Though the findings are obvious as enrobed butter cookies will most likely have more fat and higher overall liking. However, the study has shown strong evidence to accept that hypothesis and/or the research question.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title is suitable.	
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.	The abstract looks good but can be improved to give the reader a concise overview of the study. The abstract was generalized, more specificity should be included, E.g., what ratio of sample had the highest overall liking and what number was it assigned. What is the percentage increase for the physicochemical attributes of butter cookies both before and after enrobing?	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript can be said to be scientifically correct but with some modifications. How many samples were made, how were they made, what specific ingredients were used. There should be a post-hoc test on the results to indicate a detectable difference with different alphabets showing the differences.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are recent. However, the results and discussion session were lacking more comparison with other similar studies based on literature. The introduction section had sentences that needed references and in-text citation were not included.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, it is suitable.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The study is informative, and the researchers have done a great work conducting the study. PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENT	

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:	Chidimma Linda Ifeh
Department, University & Country	Montana State University, USA