

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_108080
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of different levels of Sugar and Jaggery coating on freezing of Strawberry (Fragaria x ananassa) var. Winter Dawn
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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

(<https://www.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/editorial-policy>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	<p>The manuscript is important for scientific community specifically for the field of Agricultural science with special notes to post harvest technology, food processing technology.</p> <p>Title of the manuscript is appropriate.</p> <p>The abstract of the manuscript is comprehensive.</p> <p>Appropriate</p> <p>Scientifically correct & sound.</p> <p>sufficient</p>	Noted
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	suitable	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is meaningfully & lucidly well written, scientifically robust, well referenced and technically sound and free from plagiarisms. Hence it is recommended to accept the manuscript as it is.	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	