



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_49719
Title of the Manuscript:	Postharvest Quality Of Prickly Pear Coated By Cassava Starch And Stored Under Refrigeration
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The topic should read effect of Cassava starch coating on the quality and shelf life of prickly pear in refrigerated storage. 2. The abstract should begin with at least two lines of introduction. 3. Line 65 should read materials and methods. 4. Determination of total soluble sugars in line 99 should be explained in detail in the manuscript. What has been written is a summary. 5. Determination of titratable acidity and ascorbic acid in lines 106 and 110 respectively should be explained in details in the manuscript with their respective formulas for calculating clearly written. 6. There should be a clear and concise experimental design in the materials and methods. This is a factorial experiment, therefore bring out the experimental factors, treatment levels, treatment combinations with the number of experimental units. 7. Make compulsory grammatical corrections in the entire manuscript. 8. Arrange the manuscript according to journal specifications. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Good work by authors.	

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:	Liamngee Kator
Department, University & Country	Benue State University, Nigeria