

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_125938
Title of the Manuscript:	Advances in Value Addition in Jackfruit Bulb ( <i>Artocarpus heterophyllus</i> Lam.) for Food and Nutritional Security of Rural Women
Type of the Article	Review Article

#### **PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	The manuscript is deemed necessary for the improvement of the scientific community. It will serve for the advancement of value adding for the jackfruit industry. Recommended for publication, provided the comments are considered by the author/s.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is very general, I suggest that it must be location specific.	
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 abstract is requested to contain the following: objective, location of the study (include Thailand) and specific findings per objective	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The paper if considered as scientific one must comply with the prescribed format of this journal. As an evaluator, the format should include the objective of the study, research methodology (research design, location of the study, respondents or participants of the study, data collection instrument, data collection procedure and data analysis, if any), and results and discussion based on the objective of the study.	
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.	As to scientific correction – the scientific format is not followed particularly the methodology- there is a need to revise the format. The content is technically sound, but we need to revise in accordance with the scientific and technical formats.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and recent.	

**Review Form 3**

Minor REVISION comments	Yes	
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Arthur G Ibanez</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Cagayan State University, Philippines</b>