

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_126382
Title of the Manuscript:	Development and Assessment of a Batch Type Ohmic Heating System for Milk Processing
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 based on ‘**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.	This work substantially contributes to the scientific community by offering a novel approach to milk processing based on a batch-type ohmic heating system. The study focuses on a sustainable and effective way to tackle microbial control, heating uniformity, and dairy product quality issues. The precise measurement of physicochemical changes and microbial decrease in milk adds value, particularly to the dairy industry, which continuously looks for economical, high-quality processing procedures. I admire this work for its practical implications in dairy processing optimization, as well as for identifying critical areas such as fouling on the agitator that require more investigation to improve commercial viability.	Noted
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Although the topic is fine, for more clarity it could be modified like this "Optimizing milk processing: Development and optimization analysis of a Batch Type Ohmic Heating System"	Thank you for your suggestion regarding the title. I appreciate your input; however, I prefer to retain the original title, "Development and Assessment of a Batch Type Ohmic Heating System for Milk Processing." I believe this title more accurately reflects the focus and scope of the study, emphasizing both the development and evaluation aspects of the system.
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 fine; however, it could be improved more. There must be an introductory line at the start of the abstract. Does the Ohmic System affect the nutritional and microbial quality of the milk? It should also be discussed in one line. The conclusion should be more specific.	Noted
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The whole manuscript covers the necessary sub-sections, however, there must be some future implications and limitations of the study.	Noted and included as section after conclusion in revised version
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.	A concise, well-designed experiment that precisely tests the ohmic heating system for dairy processing makes this work seem scientifically sound. It ensures accurate findings by measuring milk quality and microbiological safety using tried-and-true techniques. By optimizing the parameters using Response Surface Methodology (RSM), the study's technical base is further strengthened, lending credibility and value to its conclusions about efficiency and product quality.	Noted
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are old like from 1960 and 1992. They should be updated and add more references to support the results. In case of less data available, try to quote the relevant technique research references.	Noted
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language of the manuscript is suitable for scientific communication with technical terms where necessary. Some sentences need to be paraphrased so that coherence is maintained in the flow of the sentences. There is also a need to cross-check the grammatical mistakes present in the whole manuscript.	Noted
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)	