

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_128753
Title of the Manuscript:	Development of novel micronutrient rich Drumstick (<i>Moringa oleifera</i>) pod pulp chutney and its shelf life prediction
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>

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
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.		
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

Review Form 3

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The abstract provides an overview of the study but lacks details on the sensory and rheological outcomes.</p> <p>Include highlights of sensory improvements and the optimized combination (e.g., 61.78% drumstick pod pulp, etc.) for better clarity and impact.</p> <p>While the introduction establishes the significance of drumstick pods, it repeats details found later in the methods (e.g., blanching parameters, xanthan gum substitution).</p> <p>Some details (e.g., grinding speed and duration) are highly specific and may not add value for all readers.</p> <p>Statistical significance of the sensory attributes is presented but could benefit from more discussion on how drumstick pulp influenced the attributes.</p> <p>The interpretation of activation energy (Ea) is underdeveloped.</p> <p>Some figures (e.g., Figure 3) and tables (e.g., Table 5) are overly dense and could benefit from simplification.</p> <p>The reference section lacks uniform formatting, and some citations in the text (e.g., "Ravani et al., 2023") are incomplete.</p> <p>The manuscript has instances of grammatical errors and awkward phrasing.</p> <p>The conclusion restates findings without broader implications or future directions.</p>	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>Author's comment (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)</p>
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Gopinath Mummaleti</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>ANGRAU, India</p>