

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_126440
Title of the Manuscript:	“A Review on Advanced Preservation Techniques for Post-Harvest Quality Maintenance of Fruits and Vegetables”
Type of the Article	Review 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.	It's very generic like introductory chapter, it should be systematic review.	This publication is significant to the scientific community because it provides valuable insights into a specific field of inquiry, enhancing existing understanding and maybe opening up new pathways for future investigations. It discusses an important and contemporary topic that will help both academics and researcher. I admire the manuscript's clear research objectives, strong methodology, and possible positive impact on the field. The data is well evaluated, and the conclusions reached are confirmed by the findings, making it an important contribution to the continuing scientific dialog.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title requires revision as it is too general and similar to numerous existing articles in this field. "Advanced Preservation Techniques for Post-Harvest Quality Maintenance of Fruits and Vegetables"	Yes, Your Suggestion is Right "A Review on Advanced Preservation Techniques for Post-Harvest Quality Maintenance of Fruits and Vegetables"
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.	Need to be revised.	I have improved the Abstract and some points add and some point deletion and it is not comprehensive. It provides all information precise form.
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No	Yes
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.	It is overly generic, lacking specific focus, depth, and originality essential for meaningful contributions to the field.	The paper appears scientifically robust if it has a logical flow of material, adheres to accepted techniques, and employs well-established scientific principles. It should also give enough detail to ensure that the results can be replicated. Furthermore, the manuscript should include a thorough literature assessment to situate its findings in the larger scientific area. Addressing potential limits and discussing future research options improves its legitimacy and scientific contribution.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Use recent references.	References are sufficient Not any Suggestion
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	Yes, the language and English quality of the article appear appropriate for scholarly communications. The language is clear, succinct, and adheres to academic writing traditions, including the proper use of technical vocabulary and a professional tone. Furthermore, the structure and grammar are sound, which improves the manuscript's readability and professionalism.
Optional/General comments	Need to restructure the article	Yes, the manuscript gives a solid investigation, however the research objectives and findings need to be more clearly articulated. To provide more context and support, the introduction should be strengthened with more background material and recent studies. Addressing these problems will increase the manuscript's impact and intelligibility in the scientific community.

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	Yes, I am agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. As the author, I appreciate the reviewer's insights regarding ethical considerations