

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_112110
Title of the Manuscript:	UV-C Light Treatment to Extend the Shelf-life of Paneer (Un-ripened Soft Cheese)
Type of the Article	

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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes, the article is important for scientific community. It deals with food preservation techniques to extend the life shelf of paneer. It is a very good attempt.</p> <p>2. Yes. The title of the article is okay.</p> <p>3. Yes. The abstract of the article is in order except that, the author did not arrange it accordingly and recommendation was not included. Meanwhile, I have removed some subtitles and merged them up to flow.</p> <p>4. Yes. The sub sections and structures are okay.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically very okay.</p> <p>6. Some of the references are absolute. Therefore, they should be replaced with updated ones (from 2010 and above).</p> <p>7. The references were scientifically wrongly cited. The author should avoid the use of numbers for example (2 3) after citations, instead write the name of the author whom you cited and year of publication before or after citations. The referencing lists, I suggest the use of APA style of referencing.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English language used is okay for scholarly communication</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. The content of the work is scientifically correct and will be useful to the community. Meanwhile, the author should kindly un-underlined subheadings (2.3.2 to 2.3.3). Remove lines on subheadings.</p> <p>2. Conclusion: this should be Conclusion and recommendations please. The bases of scientific research, is to be able to give reasonable conclusion and make recommendations for a way forward. So, recommendations are very necessary in scientific research. Please take notes.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Rejoice James Mshelizah
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Agriculture, Nigeria