

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_128880
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF SHELF LIFE OF CHICKEN MALAI KEBAB AT REFRIGERATED STORAGE OF BELOW 40C TEMPERATURE
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>

Review Form 3

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.	The manuscript provides practical insights into extending the shelf life of chicken breast meat through malai spice mix marination but lacks broader scientific impact. A deeper exploration of spoilage inhibition mechanisms and implications for food safety or industrial practices is needed to enhance its significance. Incorporating advanced methods or comparative analyses could improve its contribution to the scientific community.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title 'Evaluation of Shelf Life of Chicken Malai Kebab at Refrigerated Storage Below 40°C' is functional but overly descriptive; it could be revised for greater conciseness and impact. suggested an alternative title: "Assessment of Physico-Chemical and Microbiological Shelf Life of Marinated Chicken Malai Kebab under Refrigerated Conditions"	
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 is clear but lacks a strong focus on key objectives, specific quantitative findings, and broader implications. Adding precise data for physico-chemical and microbiological parameters, a concise objective statement, and practical relevance will make it more impactful. Removing redundant phrases can also improve clarity and conciseness.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically sound but requires clarification and improvements. The temperature range for refrigeration should be corrected to below 4°C, as "below 40°C" is inaccurate. The microbiological analysis could benefit from a more detailed explanation of spoilage mechanisms in marinated samples. Additionally, the manuscript lacks statistical analysis to support its findings, which should be included for validation. Comparing refrigerated storage with freezing would also add value to the study. Overall, the scientific methods are appropriate, but these adjustments would enhance the manuscript's accuracy and rigor.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references in the manuscript are relevant but somewhat outdated, with some sources dating back to the 1970s and 1990s. To improve the manuscript, more recent studies should be included, particularly those on marination effects, modern preservation techniques, and advances in microbiological testing for poultry products. Adding references that discuss consumer preferences and shelf life of marinated foods would also enhance the manuscript's relevance and context.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	while the language is understandable, it requires refinement to enhance its scholarly tone and clarity.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript does not mention any competing interests or conflicts of interest. To ensure transparency and ethical compliance, it is important for the authors to include a statement disclosing any potential financial, professional, or personal interests that could influence the research. Including this information is standard practice to maintain objectivity and integrity in scholarly publications. several areas need improvement: 1. Language and Tone: The manuscript would benefit from improvements in clarity and adherence to a formal academic tone. 2. Outdated References: The references used are less and somewhat dated, and incorporating more recent studies would enhance the manuscript's relevance.	

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:	Behnaz Shahrokhisahneh
Department, University & Country	Cihan University-Erbil, Iraq