

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_125278
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of Various Packaging Materials on Physicochemical Characteristics of Vacuum Fried Carrot Chips During Storage Period
Type of the Article	Research Paper

#### General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

#### PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory 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>
<b>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.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The research contributes valuable information on packaging technologies, which is crucial for maintaining product quality, extending shelf life, and minimizing food waste.</li> <li>The findings can directly influence food packaging strategies in the snack industry, making this manuscript relevant to both academia and industry.</li> <li>I appreciate the study's focus on practical applications, as vacuum frying and packaging are critical components in food preservation.</li> <li>However, I believe the manuscript could benefit from a more detailed discussion of the results, along with a clearer explanation of the methodology.</li> <li>The inclusion of statistical analysis is a strength, though it could be presented more comprehensively.</li> </ul>	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	<b>Yes</b>	
<b>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.</b>	<b>Yes</b> , The abstract is comprehensive but lacks details on key findings. It could be improved by briefly summarizing the main outcomes, such as which packaging material performed best in terms of maintaining moisture content, hardness, and color.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate, with clear divisions for methodology, results, and discussion.	
<b>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.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The manuscript is scientifically robust, as it follows a methodologically sound approach with appropriate experimental design and statistical analysis.</li> <li>The use of replicates and ANOVA to determine significance supports the technical soundness of the research.</li> <li>However, the discussion lacks depth, and there is room for further exploration of the results in comparison to similar studies.</li> </ul>	

### Review Form 3

<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	Yes, but including references from the last 5 years on food preservation techniques would enrich the literature review.	
<b>Minor REVISION comments</b>  <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The English quality is suitable and the paper is written well.	
<b>Optional/General comments</b>		

### **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>Poojitha P</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Saintgits College of Engineering, India</b>