

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_100188</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Effect of different levels of carbon dioxide concentrations on qualitative traits of strawberry (<i>Fragaria x ananassa</i>) during storage var. Winter Dawn</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  <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>  <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	the manuscript is important due to the developed an integrated model approach to predict the keeping quality of strawberries packed under a modified atmosphere and increase the shelf life of post-harvest fruit <b>The title of the manuscript may be you should rewrite more suitable</b>  <b>Good efforts were done, and the manuscript is written very well</b>  The abstract of the article is more comprehensive but you must put at the end of the abstract writ short conclusion  <b>Based on the research gaps, I highly recommend writing the main research questions of the study at the end of the introduction.</b>  <b>Please write the main limitation of the study or this method.</b>  <b>The references are recent but from my point of view search for more recently</b>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	the language is very clear and easy to understand as scientific writing	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### 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>Hanan Arief Hasan</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Jerash University, Jordan</b>