

## Review Form 1.7

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | <b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>  |
| Manuscript Number:       | <b>Ms_IJPSS_102219</b>  |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>Effect of yeast and different levels of sugar on Indian olive (<i>Elaeocarpus serratus</i> L.) cider</b> |
| Type of the Article      | <b>Original Research Article</b>  |

### 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) |
|---|--|---|
| <b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments<br><br>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b><br>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)<br><br>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b><br>(If not please suggest an alternative title)<br><br>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b><br><br>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b><br><br>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b><br><br>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b><br>7. <b>References</b><br><br><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u> | yes<br><br>yes<br><br>yes<br><br>yes<br><br>no<br><br>yes<br><br>The paperwork is very detailed and well structured, with interesting data, but unfortunately, there are very serious problems with the citations and with the "References" chapter. Many works (14) cited in the main text cannot be found in "References", there are only two exceptions, maybe three! On the contrary, out of 21 works mentioned in "References", only two, maybe three are found as cited in the text!!! |   |
| <b>Minor REVISION</b> comments<br><br>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>   | okSome technical editing problems  |   |
| <b>Optional/General</b> comments  | If the paperwork is redone, in the sense of solving the problems with the bibliography and citations, it would be a very good paperwork!   |   |

### 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) |
|---|---|---|
| <b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b> | (If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details) |   |

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |                                       |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Name:                            | <b>Magdalin Leonard Dorobat</b>       |
| Department, University & Country | <b>University of Pitesti, Romania</b> |