

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_128990
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Physical and Chemical Extraction Methods on Yield of Chayote (<i>Sechium edule</i>) Tuber Starch
Type of the Article	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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Systematically compares physical and chemical extraction methods, including solvent-based, enzymatic, and mechanical techniques. Evaluates the impact of extraction parameters, such as temperature, time, and solvent ratio, on Tiber Strach yield and quality. Identifies knowledge gaps and future research directions, encouraging scientists and industries to develop more efficient, cost-effective, and environmentally friendly extraction methods.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	As the study stresses on starch, Kindly write more importance of starch in your introduction and also include advantages and disadvantages of physical and chemical methods. In material and methods change 2.2.2 and 2.2.3 to 2.2.2(a), 2.2.2(b) because 2.2.3 is a extension of 2.2.2, so kindly change the numbering. You have already mentioned T1 has concentration of 1:1 in theory, there is no need to add the ratio in table no. 1 simply mention T1. Kindly follow same et al. pattern as suggested by guidelines of journal.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	Above mentioned points should be followed, rest of the article is excellent.	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Stuti Sharma
Department, University & Country	Sardar Patel University, India