

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_102059
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of different levels of cider, baker yeast (<i>Saccharomyces cerevisiae</i>) and Hamei ((<i>Bacteria (Bacillus sp.)</i>, fungi (<i>Aspergillus niger van Tiegh.</i>) and the yeast (<i>Saccharomyces cerevisiae</i>)) on pineapple 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>)

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>YES, it is as cider is one of the popular drink that a common man can afford and any improvement in terms of taste and cost will be beneficial.</p> <p>NO, in the title the author need not specify the type of yeast, bacteria or fungi that will be used in the work. These can be mentioned in the abstract which the author has done.</p> <p>NO, in the abstract, the author need give a line or two introduction regarding cider and its present scenario.</p> <p>Appropriate</p> <p>YES as the author has supported his findings.</p> <p>YES they are, one change that can be incorporated is with regards to the page number mentioned in the references. Its better if the page numbers are mentioned with pp. Eg:pp1278-1289.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Most part of the paper the English quality is suitable, but a few spelling and grammatical mistakes are seen during the INTRODUCTION and MATERIALS and METHODS chapter.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>As this is a research article, it would have been better if the author had compared the results that he achieved i.e. the best result from the analysis T₅ with what is commercially available. I believe there are pineapple cider made from using the yeast, bacteria or fungi that the author has used in his experiment and he should have compared with T₅, then this article could have been more meaningful.</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:	Deepak K B
Department, University & Country	Vivekananda College of Engineering & Technology, India