

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_125970
Title of the Manuscript:	Development and standardization of wood apple jujube
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is important for the scientific community because it offers new insights into in the method of application of fruits studied, offering practical applications or enhancing theoretical understanding. However, I find certain aspects of the manuscript less satisfactory, such as unclear methodology, and lack of discussion, which may undermine the robustness of its conclusions.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	While the title gives an initial impression of the topic, I believe it could be refined to better align with the scope of the manuscript: Development of wood apple jujube jellies : physicochemical, sensorial and stability properties	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The use of abbreviations should be avoided Use SI units in the manuscript: "%" is not accepted unit for concentration and composition and yet you have extensively used %. All the % units used for concentration/composition must be changed to direct unit of g/kg or g/L as appropriate	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The aim of the study is not well defined	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * The methodology is not well presented *sensory consumers (n = 20) is very low for hedonic test * micro nutrients analysis need some clarifications * pH and acidity not described in MATERIALS AND METHODS * Figure 1 not given * Concentration used needs complete reformulation , references used 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Please check reference style in the text	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	There are structural errors related to spelling rules	
Optional/General comments	Discussion needs improvement	

Review Form 3

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:	Wafa Mkadem
Department, University & Country	Higher Institute of Biotechnology Sidi Thabet, University Manouba, Tunisia