

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_101129
Title of the Manuscript:	Preparation and evaluation of blended amla ( <i>Emblica officinalis</i> Gaertn) beverages
Type of the Article	Cross sectional comparative study

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. <b>YES . The squash made by using 25% pulp with TSS of 45°B exhibited the maximum liking due to its inherent characteristics.</b></p> <p>2. <b>YES . The title of the article is appropriate for study design.</b></p> <p>3. <b>YES. Abstract of the article is more comprehensive</b></p> <p>4. <b>YES. Appropriately written</b></p> <p>5. <b>YES. Well organised. Well written. Ample tables showed scientifically appropriate</b></p> <p>6. <b>Sufficient and recent references are provided.</b></p> <p><b>A cross- sectional, comparative study design was most appropriate. sample was appropriately chosen. Tools and techniques were appropriate. Data analysis was done based on objectives. Well written manuscript</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p><b>YES.</b> <b>Written in simple language. Easy to read and easy to understand. The article is very much suitable for scholarly communications.</b></p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

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

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>A. Padmaja</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>S.P.M.C.(W), Sri Venkateswara Institute of Medical Sciences, India</b>