

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_103261
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessing the suitability of Tomato products as a functional ingredient in paneer
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.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes – The research focuses on the incorporation of tomato in paneer in various formats and compares organoleptic properties as well as compositional properties which are important attributes.</p> <p>2. Yes</p> <p>3. The abstract lacks the method section and inference to the statistical tools used. The abstract jumps to the results section without mentioning what properties were evaluated. The acronyms used such as T1, T2, and T3 also needs to be expanded for better understanding. The conclusion in the abstract can be misleading since the yield and acceptability scores are lower than the control sample.</p> <p>4. The subsections should be titled appropriately for improved understanding such as 1, 1.1, 1.2 etc. Additionally, each result should be discussed in a separate subsection for better flow of the results.</p> <p>5. Although, the objective of the study is clear the writing can further be improved to further improve readability. It is unclear if the experiments were repeated for repeatability. The results section also needs to provide references to other studies while discussing results.</p> <p>6. Additional references in the results and discussion sections should be considered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider using table for the compositional result of Puree, paste, and powder - Provide sufficient details such as manufacturers, suppliers etc in material and methods. - There is no discussion or reference to additional of varied amounts of total solids, proteins when you add Paste vs. Puree @10%. Shouldn't that contribute to the final product sensory attributes as well? 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. The manuscript certainly needs to be reviewed for language/English quality.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kartik Shah
Department, University & Country	USA