

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_112787
Title of the Manuscript:	Non-Destructive Prediction of Quality Parameters in Alphonso Mangoes Using Near-Infrared Spectroscopy: A Comprehensive Study on Physicochemical Characteristics and Ripening Dynamics
Type of the Article	

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> YES; the manuscript topic and subject area are important for the scientific community. India being a leading global producer of the Alphonso mangoes enhances the Country's economic viability and therefore more efficient quality control of such important fruit is crucial for fruit export and various important procedures for a profitable mango supply chain. Therefore, understanding the physiochemical and ripening dynamics becomes pertinent for various stakeholders in the mango industry, including consumers, growers and distributors. Thereby, helping to create optimized harvesting times, storage conditions, and handling practices to ensure production and distribution of high quality mangoes for the global market. YES; the title of the article is suitable and captures the aims, results, and relevant theories of the research work. YES; the abstract is comprehensive enough; by providing a very good summary of the methodology undertaken, the aims, theories, findings and inferred conclusion of the research work, in line with standard abstract requirements. NO; the subsections and structure of the article was not completely appropriate, and it needs more information. Though the sections, subsections and necessary adequate labelling were organised appropriately; the equation stated (Eq. 3.4) was not properly written and numbered. Furthermore, the work did not include a "Literature Review" section, which is very important and should describe information that broadens the scope of the research and deepens the knowledge base of the work. The manuscript is scientifically correct, with relevant, novel and consistent information. It also contains very good, and elaborate methodology descriptions, thorough results and discussion analyses relevant to the research area and topic discussed. However, the methodology needs to be made clearer, by including a scientific description (diagrammatic or non-diagrammatic) of the process flow of steps/actions employed to obtain the relevant results. Additionally, the relevant datasets used and data source(s) information would need to be tabulated and presented. These extra information and datasets will aid the reliability of the paper and ease replication, which is an important factor for such scientific scholarly research. The references are sufficient and recent; and there is consistency in the referencing method employed in harmony with standard reference methods of scholarly articles. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> YES; the English language quality of the article is very well suitable for scholarly publication and communication. 	

Review Form 1.7

Optional/General comments	Additionally, the following points are noted by the Reviewer: I. Yes, the paper's argument is built on appropriate theories and ideas. There is an excellent results analysis and discussion carried out. However, more can be done to deepen the research by including a comparative outline or properties and relevant metrics amongst the Near Infra red spectroscopy method employed and other relevant alternatives in relation to the relevant physiochemical characteristics of mangoes and the study methodology. II. The Section ("Limitations and Recommendations"); should be added to describe the limitations related to the research work, the Near Infra red spectroscopy, as well as the methods employed. Furthermore, proper and relevant postulations will need to be added as informed recommendations pointing to the directions for further study and research improvements. III. Relevant datasets used for the analyses must be noted in the work and their respective data sources/links also stated, to further improve clarity and analyses; and aid replication of the research works as an important action in scholarly research. IV. The conclusion was observed to adequately tie together the elements of the paper.	
----------------------------------	---	--

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Chikezie Kennedy Kalu
Department, University & Country	Jiangsu University, China