

**Review Form 3**

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">Asian Research Journal of Agriculture</a>           |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_ARJA_126747  |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Assessment of Packaging Materials for Bulk Packaging of Mustard |
| 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: 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.                        | Yes, this manuscript is valuable to the scientific community as it provides new insights and potentially advances our understanding in Mustard Bulk packing field. The research addresses with thorough methodology and presents findings that may inspire further studies or practical applications. I appreciate the manuscript's clarity in data presentation and its analysis, which lends credibility to its conclusions. Overall, this work could good contribute to ongoing discussions and developments within bulk packing of Mustard. | The authors would like to sincerely thank the reviewer for taking the time to review our work and for providing such valuable and thoughtful feedback. Your insightful comments and suggestions have greatly contributed to improving the quality and clarity of our work. We truly appreciate the effort you put into reviewing our manuscript and are grateful for the constructive recommendations that will help guide our future work   |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)  | Yes   | N/A  |
| 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 fairly comprehensive, covering the main objectives, methods, and conclusions of the study. However, I suggest adding a brief mention of the study's key findings, as this would enhance the clarity and impact of the abstract for readers. Additionally, including any notable implications of the research might better emphasize the study's relevance. No deletions seem necessary at this time, as the content is concise and relevant.  | As suggested the abstract is modified and highlighted.   |
| Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?  | Yes   | N/A  |
| 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. | NA  | N/A  |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.   | Yes   | N/A  |
| Minor REVISION comments<br>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?  | Yes   | N/A  |
| Optional/General comments   | The manufacturing date of each material needs to be documented, as the age of the material significantly impacts product stability.   | On receiving the packaging materials, their mechanical properties were studied prior to their exposure of the spice and already incorporated in the manuscript. However, the properties of the packaging materials used from P1 to P5, are such plastics that do not undergo any changes over a short duration of 6 months. Whereas, in the case of multi-wall paper bags, precautions need to be taken, as moisture absorption may lead to a reduction in mechanical properties. All packaging materials were delivered to IIP immediately after manufacturing, on receipt mechanical properties were evaluated and utilized immediately. |
|   | Data at 25°C and 60% RH, or at room temperature, should be included for comparison.   | Data at 25°C and 60% RH, or at room temperature or the real time study for stable low moisture product is not recommended as it takes longer exposure and study period. It also well documented in literature. That's why all the studies need to be conducted in accelerated conditions and accordingly it has been conducted and shelf life on real time is tabulated in our manuscript, that as per literature remains minimum 3-4 times that of the accelerated shelf life.  |
|   | GSM of packing material not provided  | In case of liners, prepared through melt coextrusion process, the total thickness may only be given. Accordingly, it is expressed as total thickness, whereas, GSM is only applicable in case of paper.  |

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> |  |