

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_121478
Title of the Manuscript:	Blanching and Vacuum Drying of Jamun Leaves: A Study on Nutritional Preservation and Quality Enhancement
Type of the Article	Research

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

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (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.	It is a drying material that has been studied on drying processes and has very little research. It is a valuable study in which the effect of vacuum pressure and drying temperatures is investigated on a wide parameter. I find the study original because of these views.	-
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable.	-
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.	Minor revision.	Indicated in the text.
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure and subheadings of the article are 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.	The study is scientifically well planned and written. There does not appear to be any technical error.	-
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	The literature is very insufficient. Literature should be added to the relevant places in the text and discussed by comparing it with the scientific study. There is no specific literature citation required. It is sufficient to be up-to-date and relevant.	Indicated in the text.
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	It is useful to re-check the grammar level and readability. (Etc. Grammarly programme)	-
Optional/General comments	The study is a current and valuable study in terms of both material and method. The study is well planned and written. However, in order to be able to criticize the findings in the study and to use them healthily, references should be made to studies conducted with similar materials in the literature and they should be discussed. In order to increase the quality, suggestions have been made in the relevant places in the text, I recommend that they be done exactly. Otherwise, it is not at a sufficient level for publication.	-

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 Taşova
Department, University & Country	Tokat Gaziosmanpasa University, Turkiye