

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_94889
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of quality assessment during storage of ready-to-serve (RTS) blended from papaya, ginger and honey
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.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>In the evaluation of the manuscript "Evaluation of quality assessment during storage of ready-to-serve (RTS) blended from papaya, ginger and honey", I emphasize that in the introduction of the article it is not clear the objective and contribution of the authors.</p> <p>The methodology failed to mention references from the literature on which the methodology of the work was based.</p> <p>In item 2.5 Storage studies, there is no mention of the storage time and the intervals in which the experiments were carried out. Clarify why such specific temperatures (23.1-28.70 C) were used. Also in this item, describe the acceptance scale used.</p> <p>In the results, the authors mention statistical tests carried out, but do not specify whether the values presented are mean values and the standard deviation is also missing. Despite the text mentioning that there are differences found, it is not clear whether these differences are statistically significant.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>In general, the article describes an acceptance test of a prepared blended one, without highlighting its real contributions to the scientific literature.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

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:	Fátima de Cássia Oliveira Gomes
Department, University & Country	Centro Federal de Educação Tecnológica de Minas Gerais, Brazil