

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_100376
Title of the Manuscript:	Study the Effect of Addition of Kinnow Juice on Physicochemical Properties of Kalakand
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>)

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)	Reviewers Comments : Introduction needs to be rewritten citing scientific articles on work done related to the topic. The author has not done cost analysis and sensory evaluation but has concluded the following: This portion needs to be incorporated Use of kinnow juice treatment T3 (15 parts of kinnow juice) of <i>kalakand</i> preparation was more acceptable and desirable While in chemical composition scores, control (T1) was acceptable and liked very much but as compared to other treatment levels, T3 with 15 parts of kinnow juice gained acceptable score with like very much score. Hence, it is concluded that treatment T3 is more nutritious and cheaper for consumers. The article can be accepted after Minor revisions.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article 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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

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