

### 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**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (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.	The manuscript submitted for review has scientific application value. It refers to the application of a scientific approach to solving a specific practical problem - finding optimal values of parameters of the technological mode in the production of a food product based on pumpkin, popular in certain regions of the world. I like the article because it is related to solving a significant problem for the food industry by applying a planned experiment. In my opinion, there are weaknesses in the description of the experiment - there are no analytical expressions to support the experimental treatments. There is also a lack of data on the instruments used for measurement with their accuracy indicators.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	I believe that the title of the article is enough to indicate the main parameters of the authors' work. In effect, it shows the purpose of their robes.	
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 summary is voluminous enough. Covers information about work objectives and results achieved. No further information is needed. The authors have presented their development well.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The proposed article has a standard structure used in the publication of scientific results. I believe that the presented survey data and the results of the authors' own research are appropriately structured.	
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.	The manuscript is scientifically correct. Stylistically, it is maintained in the spirit of scientific terminology. The objectives, tasks, discussed results, conclusions and conclusions are presented graphically. The tables and graphs used clearly illustrate the procedures followed by the team. Recommended in my opinion is the use of mathematical expressions to reinforce the metrics used to define characteristics such as swelling etc.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	The analysis of the development of the problem was made on the basis of 12 literary sources, two of which have anonymous authors. 4 literary sources from the last 5 years are presented, the remaining 8 are from more than 10 years. My recommendation is to review as many literature sources as possible from the last 5-10 years, including	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Scientifically correct style and language is used. This allows those interested in the problem and its solutions to understand the essence of the author's scientific and applied work	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The publication would be useful to food technologists in countries where similar food products are being developed, as well as in areas where cost optimization and quality metrics are essential.	

**Review Form 3**

**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>Stefan Stefanov</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Rousse University "Angel Kanchev", Bulgaria</b>