

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_105468
Title of the Manuscript:	Development of Tomato and Pumpkin blended Puree for Value Addition and Shelf life with different levels of preservatives
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.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. It may be important if the author(s) go back to the raw data and perform the correct statistical analyses, expand the bibliographic review, clarify Material and Methods in detail and carry out further discussion. Much information that was reported in Results and Discussion was not included in the execution of the manuscript. It is necessary to improve and a lot the text presented, but with the necessary corrections it is possible to be reassessed.</p> <p>2. Need to be changed. Did you happen to evaluate the 'Economic Feasibility' for indication of added value! And why quote only the expiry date if so many other attributes are important! The author is responsible for the idea of a new title.</p> <p>3. Not understanding. The economy was such that it was impossible to identify what the manuscript was proposing by reading only the abstract.</p> <p>4. Yes</p> <p>5. Not. The abstract, the review of scientific articles, material and methods and the discussion are extremely poor. The entire manuscript needs to be redone.</p> <p>6. There are serious errors regarding the use of references. Absence of some cited, excessive citation not included in the manuscript. There are many up-to-date articles in the field and the author(s) need to mine these publications.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	consult the attached manuscript	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	José Carlos Fialho de Resende
Department, University & Country	Brazil