

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JSRR_123491</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Effect of Lime Concentration on physical properties on the Raw &amp; Developed Pumpkin Petha and Cost Analysis of prepared Petha</b>
Type of the 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

<u>Compulsory</u> 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.	SEE ATTACHMENT	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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.	<p>The idea behind the research work entitled “<b>Effect of Lime Concentration on physical properties on the Raw &amp; Developed Pumpkin Petha and Cost Analysis of prepared Petha</b>” is good as it will certainly help the entrepreneurs dealing with petha manufacturing for the production of good quality product. It can be accepted for publication after clarifying the below mentioned points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The paper is well written with a comprehensive and lucid language. However, there are certain deficiencies in the paper. These have been mentioned in the comments.</li> <li>➤ The authors have not statistically analyzed their data and therefore have not mentioned whether the difference between treatments is statistically significant or not. The authors need to analyze the data first.</li> </ul> <p><b>The discussion part is missing in the paper. This needs to take care of before accepting it.</b></p>	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<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>Aabida Jabeen</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Islamic University of Science and Technology, India</b>