

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_103820
Title of the Manuscript:	Standardisation of Recipes for Preparation of Value-Added Products From Dragon Fruit (<i>Hylocereus undatus</i>)
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.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes, the manuscript is important for scientific community. This paper presents a study with useful and immediate practical applications, in which the authors tested several juice variants by mixing Dragon Fruit with other fruits. Some physico-chemical and organoleptic properties of the products obtained were analyzed for 45 days, and the authors established the best formula of the final product.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title is suitable.</p> <p>3. The abstract is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. Yes.</p> <p>5. Yes.</p> <p>6. Yes.</p> <p>Remarks</p> <p>1. All the analyzes should also have been done for the raw materials that were used.</p> <p>2. Pg 2 - "The edible portion" - edible</p> <p>3. Pg 2 - "up to 46° C-48° C" - no space should be left, it is correct - °C</p> <p>4. Pg 3 - "°B" - the grade symbol should be used</p> <p>5. Pg 4 - "Deterioration of color due to enzymatic and non-enzymatic reactions" - browning reactions caused by redox reactions catalyzed by polyphenol-oxidases should be mentioned.</p> <p>6. Pg 4,5 - the use of the same sentences should be avoided, as for example: "The maximum score ofand the minimum score was recorded". The authors should modify the sentence and describe differently the factors that influence the respective process.</p> <p>7. - all the options for obtaining juices could be written in a table, to be clearer and more concise</p> <p>8. - in the Materials and Methods section, the methods used should be described, mentioning the bibliographic references;</p> <p>9. - in this section (Materials and Methods) the TSS abbreviation should be explained and how the TSS was analyzed (the values in table 1).</p> <p>10. Could the TSS values in table 1 also be explained by other processes? (release of some cellular components, evaporation of water, hydrolysis of other groups of compounds). Not all the changes that took place in the obtained juices can be explained by "conversion of polysaccharides (present in fruits) into sugars during hydrolysis process". Some values (for example for the concentration of ascorbic acid) also depend on the degree of freshness of the product.</p> <p>11. In all tables - DAS - days - should be corrected</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mariana Ferdes
Department, University & Country	University Politehnica of Bucharest, Romania