

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_100696</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Standardization of flavoured pineapple candy (Ananas comosus 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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li><b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li><b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Yes, the manuscript is important for scientific community</b></li> <li><b>Yes, the title of the article is suitable.</b></li> <li><b>Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive.</b></li> <li><b>Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</b></li> <li><b>The manuscript is scientifically correct.</b></li> <li><b>Yes, the references are sufficient and recent.</b></li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>The manuscript requires attention in the English language or use of grammar proofing software.</b></li> </ol>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>In the methodology, the equipment or materials must indicate the registered trademark TM or ® as appropriate.</b></li> <li><b>Review found several blank spaces, or words together, and typographical errors in the references.</b></li> <li><b>Scientific names are in italics.</b></li> <li><b>The writing of the conclusions at the beginning is a species between discussion and summary of important results, this must be clear and concise.</b></li> </ol>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ma. del Carmen Chávez Parga</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universidad Michoacana de San Nicolás de Hidalgo, México</b>