

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_100375</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Effect of Addition of Sapota Pulp on Physicochemical Attributes of Milk Pudding</b>
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.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><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>Reviewers Comments :</p> <p>Rewrite the abstract. Sapota is not mentioned in the abstract. The title of the article is "Effect of Addition of Sapota Pulp on Physicochemical Attributes of Milk Pudding. However, in the abstract the effect of addition of sapota on the composition attributes and acidity is only mentioned. No mention is made on the effect on physico-chemical attributes are not mentioned.</p> <p>Introduction: No references has been mentioned in introduction. Scientific literature on milk pudding is missing. Literature on sapota is written in brief without any references..</p> <p>Need to rewrite the introduction part.</p> <p>Materials and methods: <b>Gelatin was added at 45 C. after that no further heat treatment was given to the pudding?</b></p> <p>Results and discussion: In Table 1, the acidity of condensed milk is very less. Acidity of milk is expressed in terms of % lactic acid. Not % Sensory evaluation was not performed. Then on what basis the following were the conclusions drawn?</p> <p>The most acceptable quality pudding i.e. (T<sub>3</sub>) contained on an average 11.20 per cent fat, 46.73 per cent total solids, 7.02 per cent protein, 1.41 per cent ash, 25.04 per cent total sugar and 0.261 per cent acidity. The most acceptable quality pudding can be prepared by using 20 per cent sapota pulp which was found equally good.</p> <p>revisions are required before the paper is accepted for publication.</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>Optional/General</b> 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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Suneeta Pinto
Department, University & Country	SMC College of Dairy Science, Kamdhenu University, India