

**Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Food Science Journal</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AFSJ_94490</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>OSMO-Microwave Drying of Pineapple (Ananas comosus) Slices: Mass Transfer Kinetics and Product Quality Characterization</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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.journalafsj.com/index.php/AFSJ/editorial-policy>

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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	Author reported studies on OSMO-microwave drying of pineapple (Ananas comosus) slices: mass transfer kinetics and product quality characterization. The manuscript is good innovative and would add little novelty to the literature.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>The introduction</b> is good and comprehensive</li> <li>- <b>Materials and methods</b></li> <li>-Paragraph 'Apparatus' should be inserted.</li> <li>-A paragraph should be included about the chemicals used, their purity and origin.</li> <li>-It should be explained why the conditions for immersing pineapple slices in osmotic solutions at a constant temperature of 50°C for 4-6 hours were chosen.</li> <li>-In equations, i, ii, iii. % must be added after multiplying by the number 100 (Moisture Loss (ML %) = <math>\text{.....} \times 100\%</math>).</li> <li>-Rehydration ratio = <math>\text{.....} \text{?????} \text{.....}</math> (iv)</li> <li>-All graphs (Fig 2a, b, c) must be reformatted, especially the x-axis, and the accuracy of the graph should be determined, as well as the graphics should be reduced and their dimensions unified</li> <li>-In all graphs no need to chart area border.</li> <li>-It should be listed (L*-lightness, a*-redness, and b*-yellowness) below table 1.</li> <li>-In all the table 2, RSD% values should be listed at least.</li> <li>-The new innovation in this research should be highlighted compared to what is known in the references.</li> <li>-In most places. English needs to be polished.</li> </ul>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The manuscript is generally interesting and well written. My overall opinion on the text is positive and I have found only few technical issues that should be corrected.	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Safwan Ashour
Department, University & Country	Gaziantep University, Türkiye