

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_103534
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Low-Density Polyethylene on shelf life and fruit quality of Indian gooseberry (<i>Emblica officinalis</i> Gaertn.)
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> <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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The manuscript is important for scientific community. But there need some input of reference of current study</p> <p>Yes it is suitable.</p> <p>No</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes , it is</p> <p>All the references are not recent, The percentage of recent references should be more, Please add references in spite of old references.</p> <p>There are many minor mistakes, and typical error. Font size should be similar. Abstract portion should be more attractive. Add some sentences of importance of this study in abstract .Figure number is missing in section of Results and Discussion. There is no numbering. Authors wrote vary casually.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>There are some grammatically mistakes. Quality of English language should be improved.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Over the entire topic is interesting. References pattern should ne uniform. Conclusion part is so very poor. Add some sentences to make this part more interesting.</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:	Sukanya Misra
Department, University & Country	Rani Lakshmi Bai Central Agriculture University, India