

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_115779
Title of the Manuscript:	Physicochemical properties and Cost of production of cow milk shrikhand blended with Calcutta betel vine (Piper betel) extract
Type of the Article	scientific article

### General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://journaljabb.com/index.php/JABB/editorial-policy> )

### PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?  4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?  5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?  6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.  (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	I believe that the manuscript is relevant to the scientific community. The title of the article corresponds to its content. The abstract of the article conveys the whole meaning of the research and reasonable conclusions. The abstract contains a summary of the entire article. The article meets the requirements for publishing an article in the journal, that is, the structure and subsections are designed correctly. The manuscript is scientifically sound, as the characteristics of the main indicators and criteria proving the scientific nature of a particular work are given. The structure of the research data of the work is revealed, explanations are given indicating the specifics of the approaches and the technology of forming the resulting conclusion about the scientific nature of the work. Bibliographic references are designed in compliance with the requirements and contain up-to-date information.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Achkasova Elena Valeryevna
Department, University & Country	Federal State Budget Education Institution for Higher Education "Udmurt State Agricultural University", Russia