

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_130649
Title of the Manuscript:	Relative study of Sensory Quality and Physico chemical Properties of Shrikhand Prepared from cow and goat milk
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>

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.	Goat milk is an underutilized milk commercially. Goat milk possesses various health benefits, which in many cases are superior to that of cow or buffalo milk. Shrikhand is a fermented dairy product, which is quite popular among customers. Usage of goat milk in combination with cow milk in Shrikhand would be extremely beneficial for consumers. This study gives us the idea regarding acceptability of Shrikhand from mixed milk and its various physio-chemical attributes.	
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.	Yes. The abstract is comprehensive. However, few minor corrections are suggested	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, scientific evidences have been given in the article which is in accordance with the various other researches.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, most of the references are recent	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the language used in the article is suitable, however, few minor corrections are suggested	
Optional/General comments	<p>The research article written here is well composed. However, few minor corrections are suggested herewith, which should be done by the authors:</p> <p>Abstract:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Spelling mistake in Abstract:a. “Gujrat” should be “Gujarat”b. “flavor” should be “Flavour”Last line of the abstract needs sentence revision grammatically. <p>Introduction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Reference should be written correctly in proper format where there are two authors.“india” should be written as “India”Full stop should be removed before (Shridharrao, 2012)(DAHD 2019; Singh <i>et al.</i>, 2023) Sentence after this reference needs revision grammatically.“Therapeautic” spelling should be corrected <p>Materials and methodology:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">MPKV: Full form should be writtenIn 2.1.1., the word “Samples” needs to be edited“Flavor” needs to be changed to “Flavour”In 2.1.2, pH of <i>shrikhand</i> samples “was” needs to be changed to “were”. <p>Results and Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">In 3.1, 1st sentence needs to be revised grammatically.In 3.1., 2nd paragraph, sentences needs to be revised so as to have meaningful explanations. Also, the way of writing of the reference needs to be revised.In Figure 1.0, standard deviation if shown would have been better.In 3.2.1, 1st sentence needs to be revised grammatically..In 3.2.2, in 1st sentence “as” may be changed to “was”.The year “Food safety and standards regulations (2010)”, needs to be changed to (2011)In few places, statistical significant difference is written, the level of significant difference if written, would have been better.In 3.2.3, reference “Bhandage B. <i>et al.</i>, 2020” needs to be written correctly in the proper formatThe last line in 3.2.3, should be revised grammatically.	

Review Form 3

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• In 3.2.4, significantly should be changed to “significant”• The last sentence in 3.2.4, should be revised grammatically.• Many sentences in 3.2.5 should be revised grammatically.• In 3.2.6, 1st sentence should be revised grammatically. The reference in 3.2.6 should be written correctly. “KS₁, KS₂, KS₃, KS₄ and KS₅” should be elaborated.• In 3.2.7, 1st and 2nd sentence should be revised grammatically. References should be written correctly.• In 3.2.8, in 2nd line “it” needs to be removed. The last sentence in this paragraph, needs to be revised grammatically.• In 3.2.9, in 2nd line “n” needs to be removed before the word “dragon fruit pulp”. <p><u>Conclusion</u></p> <p>In 1st line the word “sensorily” may be changed to something more suitable. The 2nd line should be revised grammatically.</p> <p><u>References:</u></p> <p>The spelling of “Referance” should be corrected to “References”.</p>	
--	--	--

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:	Partha Pratim Debnath
Department, University & Country	West Bengal University of Animal and Fishery Sciences, India