

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | International Journal of Plant & Soil Science |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_IJPSS_95128 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Studies on physical attributes of bael (<i>Aegle marmelos</i> L.) fruit |
| Type of the 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>)

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p> | <p>1. The physical analyses carried out are very simple</p> <p>2. The title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>3. The abstract is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. The subsections are appropriate. However, the structure needs to be improved. The Introduction has only one paragraph, without citing any references to support the statements. The Results and Discussion section is very poor.</p> <p>5. The article is scientifically correct, however, with caveats. Robust analytics must be included to make the article relevant.</p> <p>6. There are not sufficient and not recent. There are only 10 references, and the most recent one is from 2011, with half of them before the 2000s.</p> <p>ADDITIONAL COMMENTS Although the text is well written (proper English and few formatting errors), it is an extremely simple work. The text was not prepared based on General Guidelines for Authors.</p> <p>The work has few references. The text has less than 1600 words, does not contain figures, and contains only one Table with results.</p> <p>It seems to me that it is a preliminary work that needs further deepening to become suitable for publication.</p> <p>The aim of the work is not described in the main text.</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | The language quality is suitable for scholarly communications. | |
| Optional/General 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) |
|--|--|---|
| Are there ethical issues in this manuscript? | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name: | Roberto de Souza Gomes da Silva |
| Department, University & Country | School of Chemical and Food, Federal University of Rio Grande, Brazil |