

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Food Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AFSJ_107804
Title of the Manuscript:	Production and characterization of jelly based on Lycopersicon Esculentum (tomato) fruit
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. the manuscript is important as it reports ways of transforming perishable tomatoes into value-added products. Many articles in the literature deal with tomato jam, so my question is what makes this research special? However, the introduction does not outline the use of this particular variety of tomatoes for jam production and does not give sufficient background regarding previous work on tomato jam. The objective does not show the pertinence of research. Furthermore, the Material and methods are not well defined and should be improved. The results are not well interpreted, and the discussion is poor and sometimes is not related to the interpreted results.</p> <p>THE WHOLE MANUSCRIPT MUST BE REWRITTEN</p> <p>2. The title should be reviewed since the product produced is a jam, not a jelly: jelly should be replaced by jam in the entire document. Proposed title: Production and characterization of tomato (<i>Lycopersicon esculentum</i>) jam</p> <p>3. Abstract: The abstract should also be improved after the whole document is reviewed mostly the results and discussion. The abstract should follow the guide provided to the authors by this journal.</p> <p>4. Subsections: ok</p> <p>5. Scientifically correct: no, since the material and methods are not very well explained and the results and discussion are not well presented.</p> <p>7. References: not sufficient, not enough recent, and not most are available for reading</p> <p>Some corrections were made in the manuscript (in red) Highlighted statement (Yellow) should be reformulated to better understanding (see article) Remove from the manuscript the deleted statement highlighted in Gray.</p> <p>Material and methods: Table 1 reports citric acid and pectin but they are not cited in the material, in which form was the citric acid you bought? and what type of pectin did you buy and from which company?</p> <p>Did you produce the citric acid? please explain how you got it in the method.</p> <p>Table 1: What is the link between the pectin and the lemon seed? Please explain the material and method used to produce pectin from the seed to be used in the jam preparation.</p> <p>Flow chart: The title should be under the figure.</p> <p>Jam preparation: should be improved to allow others to reproduce. More detailed information should be added.</p> <p>Replication: How many replicates were done for each analysis performed?</p> <p>Formula presentation: should be improved as differences in the font are seen.</p> <p>Formula: space should be added between the last phrase of a paragraph and each formula</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>Titration acidity formula: p was used in the formula for the calculation, and p represents mass in g or pipetted volume. Please it is confusing and provide more explanation.</p> <p>Statistics: Please double-check the stat of Table 1. The 41 is not different from 10???</p> <p>Result and discussion: The remarks in blue at the end of the highlighted statement must be considered for a better understanding. Check the whole document.</p> <p>SENSORIAL result and discussion: This PART must be entirely rewritten based on terms related to this field. Authors are invited to read more articles on sensorial research to grab the appropriate expressions to interpret the result of the sensorial evaluation. Same observation for the discussion</p> <p>Spacing: please double check spacing in the entire document</p> <p>REFERENCE:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The written references do not follow the guide provided by the journal. 2. Some references cited in the text are missing. 3. Some reported here are not cited in the text. 4. More recent references should be included. 5. Some are not available online for reading 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>No, the English quality of this article is not suitable for scholarly communication. The writing should be revised.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The research topic is interesting, but the manuscript was not properly written. The results are not well interpreted, and discussions are poor.</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:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Assoi Sylvie</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Université Peleforo Gon Coulibaly de Korhogo, Côte d'Ivoire</p>