

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_101820</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Value addition and standardization of recipe on dragon fruit jelly (Hylocerous undatus L.)</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>  <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	1. The manuscript is important, as it involves alternatives for adding raw materials to enrich pitaya jelly, which has been consumed on a larger scale in the world. However, several points must be observed in the presentation of the manuscript, as it contains serious errors, but it can be published after corrections have been made.  2. Yes  3. It is comprehensive but has bugs that must be corrected.  4. Yes  5. Not. Many corrections are needed, whose suggestions will be attached in the e-mail.  6. The authors got lost when citing references. There is an excess in the item 'References' and the absence of many that appear in the manuscript. There may even be an excess in the item, but never lack those that were mentioned.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The recommendation is that you consult the annex with the appropriate suggestions contained in the manuscript.	

### 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>José Carlos Fialho de Resende</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Brazil</b>