

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_JABB_117881
Title of the Manuscript:	DEVELOPMENT AND QUALITY CHARACTERISTICS OF CORCHORUS OLITORIUS LEAVES INCORPORATED INSTANT CHUTNEY POWDERS
Type of the Article	Original Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://journaljabb.com/index.php/JABB/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes, this manuscript is important for the scientific community because this research discusses the development of a product using Corchorus olitorius leaf powder in Instant chutney which will be a new food with nutritional density and also provide variety in daily food.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title of the article is suitable</p> <p>3. The abstract is not yet comprehensive, because there is no method in the abstract</p> <p>4. Yes, but something needs to be improved, namely antioxidants should be separated into a separate subsection from the nutritional compound of ICO</p> <p>5. The manuscript is actually scientifically correct, but the presentation and writing of the article need to be improved, and there is no previous research that can support this data.</p> <p>6. The references used are very old, up to 20 years ago. This needs to be repaired again</p> <p>7. In the introduction, the characterization parameters that will be measured, such as physical properties, mineral and antioxidant levels, have not been mentioned.</p> <p>8. The table and Figure must be referenced or cite in the sentence</p> <p>9. In the conclusion, just mention the main findings directly, there is no need to repeat the background again.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, The english quality of the article is suitable for scholarcy communications</p>	
<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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Marisca Evalina Gondokesumo SH
Department, University & Country	University of Surabaya, Indonesia