

ReviewForm1.7

JournalName:	AdvancesinResearch
ManuscriptNumber:	Ms_AIR_111544
TitleoftheManuscript:	ThePotentialof KatmonFruit(DelleniaPhilippinensis)ExtractasaNaturalFoodPreservative
TypeoftheArticle	

PART1:ReviewComments

	Reviewer'scomment	Author'scomment <i>(ifagreedwithreviewer, correctthe manuscriptandhighlightthatpartin the manuscript.Itismandatorythatauthors shouldwritehis/herfeedbackhere)</i>

ReviewForm1.7

Compulsory REVISION comments

1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?

(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)

The study is aimed at creating a natural food preservative from the extract of Katmon fruit named vernacularly as Dellenia Philippinensis, which is a main base ingredient in preserving food without any chemicals added. Katmon fruit is a wild variety of fruit known as green apple with sour taste that can be consumed raw. Since it has an acidic nature and possesses antioxidant properties, the researcher claims that the fruit extract has the potential to function as a natural preservative.

The manuscript is scientifically motivated but needs to be more data intensive in order to be relevant to the scientific community at large.

2. Is the title of the article suitable?

(If not please suggest an alternative title)

The title is consistent with the subject and rationale of the study.

3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?

The abstract provides the gist of the paper but is not all-comprehensive.

4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?

The manuscript is well-structured with appropriate subsections but has its own share of flaws.

The introduction seems relevant but lacks detailing and does not orient the reader positively.

There is hardly any information presented about the findings from the previous studies in this domain. The review of literature is not reflected in the paper which indicates the lack of depth in the study.

The research objective is clear but the problem statement is not well-defined. Moreover, the empirical deficiencies and research gaps are not addressed properly.

The methodology adopted is reasonable but lacks sufficiency.

The findings are well presented but need to be more expansive.

The conclusion is quite concise and does not reflect the scientific robustness.

The manuscript is scientifically correct and succeeds in translating the benchmark to the scientific content but is quite low on the data and replicated details of the study.

5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?

ReviewForm1.7

6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	The are hardly any pertinent references included in the body of the text. The number of old and recent references in the bibliography, made for the study is grossly insufficient.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the articles suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality throughout the manuscript lacks accuracy and needs major upgradation to become 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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sarika Chhabria
Department, University & Country	Smt. C.H.M College, India