

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_118163
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF DIFFERENT DRYING METHODS AND LEAF AGE ON THE RETENTION OF PHYTOCHEMICAL AND NUTRITIONAL ATTRIBUTES OF MORINGA LEAF POWDER
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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li><b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li><b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The concept work and the idea of the manuscript is acceptable for scientific community. Many studies on this topic have been carried out. It is best to update the research novelty with other research topics. It is likely that the similarities with other studies are very high.</li> <li>It's okay, but The research topic title has high similarity with other researchers</li> <li>This abstract is too general. Try writing more specifically and more structured</li> <li>it's okay. But The author has very little data. It is best to include supporting data in the introduction section.</li> <li>very weak. The manuscript should be rewritten again by including scientific evidence and supporting literatures.</li> <li>The research results section should be made more concise with SPSS evidence to provide reliable and valid results</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>Authors should be re-modifying again to be suitable for scholars. There is a lot of review that researchers need to do in writing the introductory chapter</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> 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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Dewa Ayu Made Adnyaswari
Department, University & Country	Udayana University, Indonesia