

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Food Research and Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFRN_96492
Title of the Manuscript:	Saltiness and hedonic liking rating of miso soup associated with conscious salt reduction levels: a consumer acceptance study with gradual salt reduction
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://journalajfrn.com/index.php/AJFRN/editorial-policy>

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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. 1. Actually, I think yes, this manuscript is addressing two kinds of issues: one is related to food & health side, and another issue is related to consumer behavioural (marketing). Moreover, as this topic is very interesting and up to date. 2. Yes. 3. Yes, very good. 4. Yes, in nicely organized. 5. Yes I think. 6. Yes. The references are sufficient and recent.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	To be honest with you. I am not expert in this part. But I think it is good.	
Optional/General comments	I thank the author(s) selected an interesting topic, and good quality research. If you look at the objective of the manuscript, you will see it is very clear and logical. On the other hand, if you look for the result, you will see the objective/s of study is achieved. The methodology include instrument, sample, data analysis tools and app, discussion of results and conclusion, everything is good. Overall is excellent	

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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Yousf Ibrahim Aljoudimi
Department, University & Country	Bani Waleed University, Libya