

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_102219
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of yeast and different levels of sugar on Indian olive (<i>Elaeocarpus serratus</i> L.) cider
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>)

RT 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 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. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community. Yes, the title of the article is most suitable The abstract of the article is Comprehensive The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate The manuscript is scientifically correct The references are sufficient and recent ones provided the following points are attended. 1) References needs to be modified strictly as per the journal format 2) The 16 references (blue coloured) cited in the text are missing in References. Provide these 16 References. 3) The 18 References (Yellow coloured) given at the end are not cited in the text. Either cite these in the text suitably or delete them from References.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications. However, needs a few modifications as suggested in the manuscript.	
Optional/General comments	Follow author guidelines	

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	R. A. Balikai
Department, University & Country	University of Agricultural Sciences, India