

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_100375
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Addition of Sapota Pulp on Physicochemical Attributes of Milk Pudding
Type of the Article	Short communication.

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>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	YES YES The abstract is very scanty. There is no introduction and the methods of preparation of milk pudding was not properly stated. No conclusion in the abstract. The abstract should be re written to address these faults. YES Not scientifically correct. The materials and methods are confusing. The references are not sufficient and recent. Two types of citations in the body of the work is not accepted. Either the use of figure (1, 2,3.....) or name of author and year like Ghule (2015). The key words are insufficient. Suggested key words include; physiochemical attributes, milk pudding, sapota pulp and buffalo milk.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	NO. Poor and grammatical errors.	
Optional/General comments	There should be revisions before the paper is accepted for publication. Not enough citation in the discussion. The discussion is very scanty and not elucidated.	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ndubueze Amaechi
Department, University & Country	Michael Okpara University of Agriculture, Nigeria