

Review Form 3

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

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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Yes	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, but it needs to be improved.	
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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Should be improved.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Should be amended and undergo language editing.	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Numbering the manuscript's lines would be better to facilitate the reviewing process. Please consider that in the revised version.2. Please uniform the word post-harvest or postharvest throughout the manuscript's text, but do not mix between them.3. The title should be written whether capitalized in each word or sentence case.4. Please replace Key word with keyword (i.e., one word) and reorder the keywords alphabetically.5. The abbreviation of Total Soluble Solid is written as TSS and T.S.S. Please uniform the writing form throughout the text.6. What about the limitations of this study? The authors should mention the study's limitations.7. Some literature reviews are not cited in the references list, for instance, Gomez and Gomez (1996), Jagdeesh et al. (2006), Jagdeesh (1994) and so on. The authors should ensure that all literature reviews are cited in the references list and vice versa. Please double-check and rectify.8. The references list should be reformatted according to the journal's guidelines and style. Please consider this comment for all references.9. The manuscript includes many grammatical and typos issues. Please consider this comment.	

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:	Mahmoud Okasha
Department, University & Country	Egypt