

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_125533
Title of the Manuscript:	Studies on Organoleptic Evaluation of Aonla (<i>Emblica officinalis</i> G.) Squash during storage
Type of the 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

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>
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.	This manuscript is highly relevant to the scientific community as it explores innovative methods using preparations from different varieties and how these can interfere with the organoleptic characteristics of the final product. The results are promising; however, some adjustments are needed throughout the work. I appreciate this manuscript for its practical implications and quantitative approach, as it establishes a solid foundation for future research.	
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.	The abstract needs to be restructured to better present the study.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes.	
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 article is highly relevant; however, it requires additional information in the methodology and a more in-depth discussion, both in comparing the obtained results and in seeking explanations in the literature that justify these results. Furthermore, it is essential to present a conclusion.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	The references are in compliance; however, the file needs to be reviewed for formatting.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	ok	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Uasley Caldas de Oliveira
Department, University & Country	State University of Mato Grosso, Brazil