

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
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

<u>Compulsory</u> 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.	Increasing the shelf life of food and reducing waste are among the challenges facing the world today, and they are important issues in the food industry. The topic of the conducted research is appropriate and practical; however, it requires additional tests to reach conclusions, and it appears that some necessary tests have not been performed.	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.	Grammatical errors that need to be corrected are suggested in red in the text	Corrected and highlighted in the manuscript
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.	In order to complete the research, several tests, including microbial tests, texture analysis, and rheological tests, must be performed.	<p>When discussing the necessity of microbial tests for whole mustard seeds, particularly when they are intended for use as a whole spice rather than processed into products like mustard paste, it is essential to clarify the rationale behind this decision. Whole mustard seeds are often used in cooking and food preparation, where they are typically added to dishes without further processing. In this context, the risk of microbial contamination may be perceived as lower compared to more processed forms that are more susceptible to spoilage. Nevertheless, any microbial growth observed during the storage period was meticulously documented and included in the accompanying table.</p> <p>Rheological and textural tests were not included in this study, as it was part of a standard development process for spice exporters and therefore fell outside the scope of this research. Whole mustard seeds are typically used in cooking for their flavour and aroma rather than for their textural properties. Since whole mustard seeds are not subjected to processes like milling or emulsification (as in mustard paste), the need for rheological testing—focused on flow and viscosity—becomes less relevant. Whole seeds do not exhibit the same flow properties as pastes or liquids.</p> <p>However, we appreciate the reviewer's feedback and will consider incorporating such parameters for processed products in future studies.</p>
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Some paragraphs need references that must be added. Items are specified as comments in the text	Added references and highlighted in the manuscript
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Minor corrections are needed; suggested corrections have been added to the text in red colour.	Corrected and highlighted in the manuscript
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This is why, in the outermost layer, PE is used to replace PA to achieve improved mechanical properties and observe the effect of higher performance material.	PA is an engineering polymer recognized for its excellent chemical resistance, gas barrier properties, aroma retention, puncture strength, and bursting strength. This is why, we have replaced PE with PA to achieve improved mechanical properties compared to PE. However, there was a typographical error on our part, which has now been corrected.

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>	