

## 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 (<i>Hylocerous undatus</i> 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 REVISION</b> comments <b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> <b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>  <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	1- The title and abstract cover the main aspects of the work and it spark interest to the right audience. Technical quality and the experiment proposed by the authors are very-well conducted and can be a good start for industrial application. The experiment was planned and conducted properly.  2- Yes, the title of the article suitable. 3- Yes, the abstract of the article comprehensive. 4- Yes, subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate.  5-Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct.  6- The references are not sufficient and not recent.	1- The experiment was planned and conducted properly.  2- The title of the article suitable.  3- The description of the results is concise and concrete. The authors compared their own results with the results of other researchers.  4- This paper is novel and an advancement of the field.  5- All the data for authors (e.g. sequence reads, code, questionnaires used) available for the readers.  6- Provided was very good but the references used were inadequate and modern.	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes, language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications.	The choice of analytical methods is accurate.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Basically, this is a very deep research report, and it is excellent for the publication.	The manuscript provided enough details for the general reader.	

### 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>Mona Abd El-Kader Mohamed Abd El-Gawad</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>National Research Centre, Egypt</b>