

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JABB_122669</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Postharvest quality of Guava (Psidium guajava L.) Cv. Dhawal Fruit affected by different physico-Chemical Treatments</b>
Type of the 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**

<b>Compulsory</b> 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.	This study is of great importance by addressing the pressing need for prolonging the shelf life of guava. Different biodegradable materials were selected and applied to increase the shelf life, so this topic is considered useful and insightful in terms of reducing the losses of agricultural products. However, more writing is required to ensure the appropriateness of the manuscript.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is fine, but the way to write the scientific name should be changed. A suggested title is given below: Postharvest quality of Guava ( <i>Psidium guajava</i> L.) Cv. Dhawal Fruit affected by different physico-Chemical Treatments	
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.	No, it is not. It lacks information about the objectives of the study and measured parameters, so we do not know what the study need. Comments are already given in the reviewed manuscript, so the author just addresses them carefully.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, it contains all subsections to be a paper format. However, in each section, modifications are required. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In the introduction, statements are written without giving sufficient references to support. Although the importance of guava production and the cause to its losses are mentioned, plant-based materials used for coating are not sufficiently stated. For example, corn starch is mentioned, but Aloe vera is not. So, please also state the importance of using Aloe vera for prolonging the shelf life of guava.</li> <li>- In the method, the experimental place and year are mentioned, while the treatments are stated without giving their details, so it is hard to imagine how each treatment was arranged and prepared for the experiments. Besides that, the statistical tests and procedure should also be detailed, so that it is easy for the reader to understand the way the study was compared.</li> <li>- In the results, both graphs and tables are given to show the same findings. Actually, one can be selected from the two, but not two. In addition, alphabetic letters should be given to the tables to clearly see the differences.</li> <li>- The conclusion section should be more specific. For example, the author should specify which the optimal duration is with best treatment. Besides, some suggestions for future studies should also be stated.</li> </ul>	
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.	In terms of correctness, the manuscript still needs improvements. The first one is to use suitable English language, while giving sufficient references are strongly recommended. Besides that, detailing methodology used for the study is important, and the way to show the findings is also vital.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	No, they are not, so the author should add more to support the statements of the study.	

**Review Form 3**

Minor REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The language used in the writing is considered good, but corrections are needed because plagiarism was also found.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	This manuscript should be considered for publication only when the author addresses the comments appropriately. Otherwise, it is not good enough for the scientific community.	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Hin Lyhour</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Royal University of Agriculture, Cambodia</b>