

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_126399
Title of the Manuscript:	Chemical quality parameters of Mandarin (<i>Citrus reticulata</i> Blanco.) fruits influenced by different organic sources
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The title /topic is very much important among scientific community because citrus is the third most important fruit crop of India after mango and banana. I like it because i have also work on Sweet Orange cv. Mosambi and Kinnow mandarin. It is cultivated all over India, that's why it is very important fruit crop.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Biochemical properties of Mandarin (<i>Citrus reticulata</i> Blanco.) fruits as influenced by different organic sources	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Abstract is not up to the mark. I have already given the remarks in the metadata.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No, the result and discussion is just copy and paste of their thesis. It was not written as a research paper	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Abstract of the paper is not written in appropriate manner. All the write-up like result and discussion, abstract, conclusion, references etc. are not appropriate.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Number of references are sufficient but not written symmetrically in one format	
Minor REVISION comments	Major revisions are required with English quality	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	After major revision it can be accepted for final publication	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kumari Karuna
Department, University & Country	Bihar Agricultural University, India