

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Food Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AFSJ_90955
Title of the Manuscript:	Physico-chemical properties of two local varieties and sensory attributes of homemade bakery products of pineapple compare with the locally available market products in Bangladesh
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:

<https://www.journalafsj.com/index.php/AFSJ/editorial-policy>

Review Form 1.6

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	<p>Please, the following should be taken into consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All words / sentences / paragraphs highlighted in yellow are well reviewed (some are deleted, added, or modified etc.) as the context requires. Please, write the article according to the General Guidelines for Manuscript Preparation for AFSJ system. The paper is not based on rigorous academic standards. There are no real discussions of the results, the discussions are only similar studies, and all the results are completely identical with them. So what is new in the study i.e. the researcher's point of view, the reason for the changes as a result of using plant parts, etc., should be highlighted. This is a study in which humans were used for sensory evaluation, therefore, it was necessary first to take the approvals of the Scientific Research Ethics Committee (in the college or university???) and this is referred to as the study. <p>Title: The title of the paper is not good, and I prefer it to be as follows: comparison of physico-chemical and Sensory attributes of two types of pineapple baked products with locally available market products in Bangladesh.</p> <p>Abstract:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All scientific plant names and botanical families are written in italics. It is preferable that the keywords do not contain the words contained in the study title (because the title words appear mainly on the search on the international information network), so other words from the estimated search results are preferred to increase the chances of the search appearing on the international information network. The term followed by the acronym in parentheses is written for the first time only, and then the acronym is used only after that throughout the search. <p>Introduction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The introduction not provides the sufficient background information All scientific plant names and botanical families are written in italics Please, rewrite the aim of the paper in a way that matches the new default title <p>Materials and Methods:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is a study in which humans were used for sensory evaluation, therefore, it was necessary first to take the approvals of the Scientific Research Ethics Committee (in the college or university???) and this is referred to as the study. The most of analytical methods are official (AOAC) methods and have been known for decades, so it is preferable that they not be explained, but only their reference is indicated. Where is the Taxonomy or plant scientifically confirmation??? It would have been preferable to have it explained, the tools/instruments used in them, and the working conditions in detail. <p>Results and Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no real discussions of the results, the discussions are only similar studies, and all the results are completely identical with them. So what is new in the study i.e. the researcher's point of view, the reason for the changes as a result of using plant parts, etc., should be highlighted. In the paper, you used the numerical method for writing references, so why use the literal (descriptive) method here? In the paper, you used the numerical method for writing references, so why use the literal (descriptive) method here? <p>References</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some references need to be revised and supplemented. 	
Minor REVISION comments	See the Manuscript Revised File attached	
Optional/General comments	See the Manuscript Revised File attached	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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:	Yousif Abd El-Aziz Elhassaneen
Department, University & Country	Minoufiya University, Egypt