

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_110935</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Essential Principles of Postharvest Heat Treatments in Fruit Crops</b>
Type of the Article	

### **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> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p><b>Yes. The manuscript is of a great importance to science especially to the area of nutrition/agriculture. It provided insight in to handling post-harvest of fruit and vegetable spoilage.</b></p> <p><b>No.</b> <b>Suggested Topic: Assessment of Molecular dynamics of Postharvest heat treatments in fruit crops.</b></p> <p><b>No. The abstract is not well constructed. I have already make a not in the reviewed manuscript of how the abstract can be re-written.</b></p> <p><b>Yes.</b></p> <p><b>Yes. The manuscript is scientifically correct.</b></p> <p><b>The references are sufficient. But the author should work more o the references. Some of the references are too old to base this study on, there are newer studies available already.</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p><b>Yes. The English is of high quality.</b></p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Suggested way of writing an abstract is as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <b>brief introduction of the study, (in just 3 lines),</b></li> <li>➤ <b>highlight the problem or justification of the study,</b></li> <li>➤ <b>then, a summary of the result, and</b></li> <li>➤ <b>conclusion (in 2 lines.)</b></li> </ul> <p>Make the abstract catchy enough so it will get readers interested in your work. Abstract is what most people read before they will decide to read the whole paper.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<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>Asa Adedoyin Ayobami</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>National Root Crop Research Institute, Nigeria</b>