

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>)

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. Since nutrition plays an important role in the quality of life. Depending on the importance of this fruit in daily nutrition, its maintenance can be one of the concerns of society and people. 2. It is suitable. 3. In the introduction and review of the abstract of the literature the introduction of the fruit has been repeated. It is better to remove it from section. 4. Why is the review of the texts included in the abstract section? The abstract is too long. They can summarize the topics in one paragraph. 5. The manuscript needs to English edit. 6. References are not mentioned in the manuscript of the article. 7. Where are the photos in the article taken from(Figuer1,2)? Is there a letter of consent from the owner of the photos?If it is prepared by the authors themselves, it should be mentioned in the text. 8. In Figure 5, the names of the groups are not given. 9. The software and tests used are not mentioned in the method section. 10. It is a short discussion. Use new sources to write it strongly. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	The manuscript needs to English edit.	
<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:	Razieh Parizad
Department, University & Country	Tabriz University of Medical Sciences, Iran