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

Compulsory REVISION comments	**Reviewer's comment**	**Author's Feedback** *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
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.	
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.	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.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	**Yes**	
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**	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	**Yes**	
Minor REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	Yes	
Optional/General comments		

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Naveenkumar Rajpudi**
Department, University & Country	**Bharath Institute of Higher Education and Research, India**