

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_125556
Title of the Manuscript:	Standardization Of Recipes And Storage Behaviour Of Value-Added Products From Knol-Khol (Brassica oleracea var. gongylodes L.)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

#### **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>

### Review Form 3

#### 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.	Knol-khol an important vegetable of Brassicaceae family which is rich source of several vitamins and minerals . Since it cannot be grown in all climatic conditions , its exploitation in the processed form like nectar and squashes is an excellent value addition idea to ensure its year around availability. This is a good piece of work and the result would benefit growers, processing industry personnel and consumers and also help prevent post harvest losses.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Yes, Make changes as suggested in the manuscript	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. Abstract contains gist of the work done. Introduction and material and methods are apt and give clear picture of the purpose and procedure. The discussion part is thorough with a valid conclusion. <b>Add the name of the crop in the key words</b> <b>However, objective needs to be rewritten for better clarity.</b>	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	Yes, references sufficient and recent. Some more recent one may be added if possible.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the language/English quality of the article suitable is highly for scholarly communications.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Satisfactory write-up if <b>objective is rewritten with better clarity.</b>	

#### PART 2:

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

#### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sangeeta Shree
Department, University & Country	Bihar Agricultural University, India