

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAF_104289
Title of the Manuscript:	REVOLUTIONIZING SAPOTA PRESERVATION: UNVEILING THE REMARKABLE EFFECT OF NAT MUR 30C IN PROLONGING ITS SHELF LIFE - AN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajraf.com/index.php/AJRAF/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is information about the conservation method of sapota. 2. Title suggestion "EFFECT OF NAT MUR 30C IN PROLONGING SHELF LIFE of sapota" 3. Some information must be indicating the analyses carried out and the results obtained. 4. Must be reorganize the introduction, materials and methods, results and discussion, conclusion, and references items. 5. Some suggestions must be mentioned. 6. yes <p>Considerations and suggestions: Page 1, deleted the phrase "REVIEW OF LITERATURE: Sapota, also known as chikoo or sapodilla, is a tropical fruit that is highly nutritious and delicious." In the text ... "For example, a study published in the International Journal of Agriculture and Biology in 2013 found that a homeopathic treatment with Thuja occidentalis increased the shelf life of apples." and "Similarly, a study published in the Indian Journal of Agricultural Research in 2016 found that a homeopathic treatment with Natrum muriaticum increased the shelf life of papayas.", he authors and year of publication must be included, not the journal. Follow the journal's guidelines for indicating references. page 3, we have the introduction title again. reorganize the sequence of the bibliographic review in the introduction. References must be added. If there are studies on the methods used, mention them in the text. At the end of the review mention the objective of the work. Indicate how the analysis was performed. Make a brief description, if there is a reference, indicate. What is the composition and function of "Natrum Mur 30 CH" Page 5, results are presented, however there is no results item. Tables and Figures were placed, but in the text they are neither mentioned nor described about the results. There was statistical analysis, it should be mentioned in the materials and methods how this evaluation would be. Discussion, in this item the results should be compared with information presented in the literature. Conclusion it must be indicated if the proposed method fulfills the objective of the research. Reorganize the introduction, materials and methods, results and discussion, conclusion and references items. Standardize the symbology used in the presentation of results in Figures as 1 and 2 or A and B.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Monica Beatriz Alvarado Soares
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Santa Maria, Brazil