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 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.	This article is very interesting and up-to-date in terms of its topic, as the dairy industry is of great importance and requires the best processes for pasteurization and heat treatment. However, in the results section, this research has some weaknesses, as it only reports findings and needs to provide reasons and comparisons with other results or methods. Additionally, comments for improving this work have been included in the article file, and addressing these issues will enhance the quality of the work	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is comprehensive and appropriate for the research	
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.	It is well presented in the abstract and the materials and reports	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure of the article is appropriate	
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.	This article is very suitable from two aspects: the first aspect is the design and construction of this device and the presentation of its specifications, and the second aspect is that the researchers have presented the results in the same article, which enhances the quality of the work and makes it likely that this article will be widely read if the issues are addressed by the readers. Additionally, this article reports suitable results from the work	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	One of the issues with this work is the lack of up-to-date sources. Additionally, the number of articles used is very low. In each section, various sources should be provided; for example, in the materials and methods section, anything that is not specific to the researchers' work requires a reference.	
Minor REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	The writing structure of the article is suitable for the reader in terms of fluency	
Optional/General comments	In general, the article is appropriate in terms of structure and topic, but it requires the following changes: 1. The introduction should be rewritten. 2. References should be provided for formulas and anything that you did not create yourself. 3. In the results and discussion section, there is no discussion or comparison that needs to be included Despite this need for improvement, the article demonstrates strong scientific content and remains current with the latest developments in the field. The topics addressed are relevant and significant, making it a suitable candidate for publication. With the implementation of the necessary revisions, I believe this article has the potential to be published and make a valuable contribution to the literature . I found the research to be scientifically sound and well-structured, addressing important aspects of the topic.	

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:	**Mohammad Vahedi Torshizi**
Department, University & Country	**Tarbiat Modares University, Iran**