

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_126440
Title of the Manuscript:	A Review on Principles and Methods of Preservation of Vegetables and Fruits
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

<u>Compulsory</u> 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.	
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"	
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.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No	
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.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Use recent references.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Need to restructure the article	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sadia Hassan
Department, University & Country	The University of Faisalabad, Pakistan