

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JSRR_121685</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Organoleptic Evaluation of Tree Bean (Yongchak) Dishes of Manipur and Value Added Cutlet with Incorporation of Tree Bean (<i>Parkia roxburghii</i>)</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

## Review Form 3

### 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>
<p><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></p>	<p>This manuscript is important for the scientific community because it explores the under-researched area of tree bean (<i>Parkia roxburghii</i>) culinary applications, particularly in the context of Manipur. The study's focus on organoleptic evaluation and development of value-added cutlets not only highlights the nutritional benefits of tree beans but also offers potential for enhancing food diversity and promoting sustainable agricultural practices. I appreciate the manuscript for its thorough methodology and its practical implications for food science, nutrition, and local economies. However, the manuscript could benefit from clearer articulation of the research question and more detailed statistical analysis, which would strengthen its contributions to the field.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>The current title, "Organoleptic Evaluation of Tree Bean (Yongchak) Dishes of Manipur and Value-Added Cutlet with Incorporation of Tree Bean (<i>Parkia roxburghii</i>)," is descriptive and gives a clear indication of the study's content.</p>	
<p><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></p>	<p>The abstract provides a good overview of the study's aims, design, methodology, results, and conclusions. However, it could be improved for clarity and comprehensiveness, clarifying the Aim and highlight Key Results.</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate for a scientific study. The manuscript includes clear and relevant sections, such as the abstract, introduction, materials and methods, results and discussion, and conclusion. These sections follow a logical flow that aids in the understanding of the study's aims, methodology, findings, and implications.  <b>Suggestions for improvement:</b>            A more in-depth discussion of the results in the context of existing literature would add value. The conclusion could be more concise and focused on the key findings and their implications for further research.</p>	
<p><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></p>	<p>The manuscript demonstrates scientific correctness through its systematic approach to evaluating the organoleptic properties of tree bean dishes and developing a value-added cutlet. The use of a nine-point hedonic scale by twenty-five semi-trained panellists provides a robust methodological framework for sensory evaluation. Additionally, the clear presentation of results, including the statistical analysis of acceptability, supports the reliability of the findings. The manuscript's attention to detail in describing the experimental design and procedures ensures that the study is technically sound and can be replicated by other researchers.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<p>The manuscript has 13 references, most of which are mentioned in the document only once. Four references are less than 5 years old; 6 references are between 5 and 10 years old and 1 reference is more than 10 years old. This analysis shows that the number of references is appropriate for the type of work and the range of the chronological line of references (2011-2023) is within an acceptable standard. However, it could be improved by adding more recent studies to strengthen the literature review.            Reference number 5 is not cited in the document.            Reference number 12 shows 2023 as the year of publication and the citation indicates 2022.            References should be placed in alphabetical order.</p>	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications. However, I recommend a general review of the English, to ensure that the language is clear and concise.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Overall, the study makes a valuable contribution to the understanding of tree bean's potential in culinary applications and offers a foundation for further research in this area.	

### **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>Manuel Serra</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>School of Management, Hospitality and Tourism, University of Algarve, Portugal</b>