

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_105350
Title of the Manuscript:	Standardisation for Preparation and Storage Stability of Papaya Candy (Carica papaya)
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://journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, the manuscript is important for scientific community as scientists particularly home scientists / food technologists can refer the treatments for preparation of candy from other underutilised fruits. Storage stability can also be enhanced by using other scientific methods and packing material.</p> <p>An alternate title can be Standardization of recipe for preparation of Papaya candy and its storage stability.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ In material and methods recipe for preparation of papaya candy could have been elaborated in addition to climatic conditions of experimental area. It should also be mentioned whether raw papaya were used for preparation of candy or ripened one. ➤ Cost benefit Ratio is not mentioned anywhere in anyTable, whereas it was written in conclusion that Treatment T₇ was found best in terms of quality, storage stability and Maximum B: C ratio. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kavita Sharma
Department, University & Country	Krishi Vigyan Kendra, CSKHPKV, India