

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_121886
Title of the Manuscript:	Development and quality evaluation of RTC Banana pseudo stem vermicelli upma mix
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

<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.	In this manuscript, the author tried to develop a ready-to-cook (RTC) vermicelli upma mix via the incorporation of a banana stem. They have developed suitable ingredient compositions. They also check the stability of the products over six months. I would like to recommend it for publication though it needs to be revised further to make it suitable for publication.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No. It would be Development of ready to cook banana pseudo stem vermicelli upma mix with quality evaluation	
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.	Comprehensive	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	They need to revise it. I marked it in the main manuscript.	
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 food item that is tried to develop in this manuscript. It is very important for dietary and healthy food. They optimized the composition and evaluated the quality of the food.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions for additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	Reference is enough but they should cite more recent articles in the introduction. They can cite this paper. https://journals.du.ac.bd/index.php/dujs/article/view/35 Compare with the following article <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DOI: 10.9734/ejfnfs/2020/v12i930281 (Development and Quality Evaluation of Ready to Serve (RTS) Beverage from Banana Pseudo Stem • September 2020 • European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety) 	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English quality is not suitable. They need to check the spelling and sentence pattern very carefully. There are so many mistakes.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	It can be accepted after the revision based on comments and suggestions given in the manuscript.	

Review Form 3

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:	Muhammed Shah Miran
Department, University & Country	University of Dhaka, Bangladesh