

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_110791
Title of the Manuscript:	STUDIES ON PREPARATION OF MANGO PICKLE FROM DIFFERENT GENOTYPES OF AKOLA MAHARASHTRA REGION
Type of the Article	Research article

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> 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)	1. Besides the fact that the subject is very simple, the genotype and the experimentation of different recipes can contribute scientifically. However, when physicochemical properties are evaluated, it is thought that the use of so many ingredients in the recipes reduces the reliability of the results. In addition, although the introduction is insufficient, it was observed that the necessary references were not added to some sentences, and the citations in different format (citation in parentheses) were forgotten in the text. The authors mentioned that “organoleptically accepted mango pickles....”, but there is no organoleptical evaluation in the article. 2. The title of the article is suitable 3. Yes, it is comprehensive 4. Yes, it is 5. I think there are some deficiencies in the methodology of the article (e.g. the pickle is not in the form of a real pickle, the recipes contain too many ingredients and therefore affect the real effect). 6. The references are not sufficient and recent. Additionally, in some sentences, the necessary citations were not added.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1. The language quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### 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)	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Fadime Begüm Tepe
Department, University & Country	Giresun University, Turkey