

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_101173
Title of the Manuscript:	"STUDY ON DEVELOPMENT AND STORAGE OF BLENDED PINEAPPLE (Ananas comosus L.) MANGO (Mangifera indica L.) CRUSH"
Type of the Article	Original Practical 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)
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. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	<p>The article submitted for review is quite interesting, as it is aimed at obtaining an interesting final product that is useful for many categories of consumers. However, in my opinion, this is not research material, but largely practical research material, which, as already indicated, allows you to get a new food product that is useful for consumers. In this regard, I changed the type of article and highlighted the change in red font.</p> <p>The abstract of the article comprehensive</p> <p>The abstract of the article comprehensive Yes</p> <p>I think the manuscript is scientifically correct</p> <p>the references sufficient and recent</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications	
Optional/General comments	When preparing the article material for publication, it should be taken into account that of the 22 sources cited in the article, more than a third are outdated and published more than 25 - 40 years ago. They should be replaced by more "fresh" publications, especially since there are a large number of such publications.	

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:	Yakov G. Verkhivker
Department, University & Country	Odessa National University of Technology, Ukraine