

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_119287
Title of the Manuscript:	Development of Low Fat Gujarati Traditional Snack “Ganthiya” using Hydrophilic Polymers and Modified Natural Polysaccharides
Type of the Article	Original Research 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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The manuscript is quite important for the scientific community, because the author researched the reduction of oil content of Gujarati Ganthiya snacks using 2 processing variables, namely frying temperature and frying duration. The title of the article is quite suitable and acceptable The abstract of the article reviewed by the author is quite comprehensive, the author writes the objectives and results in the abstract which can help in concluding The subsections and structure of the manuscript are quite appropriate In my opinion, the manuscript is quite correct scientifically, the author explains it in a structured and systematic manner, but I did not find a gap analysis, where there is a gap between current research and previous research. In my opinion, the references are sufficient and up-to-date, the use of references and up-to-date is sufficient. At least use references from the last 5 years as much as 40% of the number of references used 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	In my opinion, the quality of articles in English is suitable for scientific communication?	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Iqbal Ramadhani Mukhlis
Department, University & Country	Universitas Pembangunan Nasional Veteran Jawa Timur, Indonesia