

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_100696
Title of the Manuscript:	Standardization of flavoured pineapple candy (<i>Ananas comosus</i> L.)
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Manuscript (experiment) is important especially for practice. 2. Title of manuscript does not correspond with the article content. Alternative title: Selected parameters of flavoured pineapple candies. 3. Comprehensiveness of abstract is at an acceptable level. 4. Structure of manuscript is appropriate generally. 5. Yes. Manuscript generally meets criteria for Original Research Article. Some terms used in the article are not appropriate for this type of article. Only one source is cited in the Introduction. The Material and Methods require modification – addition (see comments of reviewer in manuscript). Discussion is very “brief”, some explanations of author/authors are not correct. The reviewer considers the economic evaluation to be a positive contribution of the author/authors. 6. Authors cited ten sources only and only two are from last five years. Citation style is incorrect (see comments or reviewer in manuscript. Check the format of References according to instructions for authors (look https://journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/about/submissions#authorGuidelines). 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	No. Needs improvement.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	Results of statistical analysis are very briefly used in Result and Discussion. For scientific articles, citing of a greater number of relevant and recent sources is required. I recommend using photo documentation from the experiment in the article.	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Eduard Pintér
Department, University & Country	Institute of Horticulture, Slovak University of Agriculture, Slovakia