

## Review Form 1.7

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name:            | Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology                                |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_CJAST_104924  |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Evaluation of suitability of tomato solids as a preservative in flavoured 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.journalcjust.com/index.php/CJAST/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) |
|--|---|---|
| <p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b><br/>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b><br/>(If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p> | <p>1. This manuscript present important result on role of solid tomato. Despite this helpful data on global nutrition chain and the study has low impact for scientific community.</p> <p>2. yes, the title of the article fits with the content</p> <p>3. Yes, but the authors can make it more soft and provide better conclusion than what is there now</p> <p>4. For structure:<br/>a) <b>Abstract has generally 5 parts:</b> Background (statement of study, justification and aim/objective), Methodology (study design/type, study site, sample and sampling method, data collection method and data analysis technic), Results, Conclusion and key-words.<br/>b) <b>Materials and method:</b> study design shall be presented with more details before Raw materials.</p> <p>5. Yes it is, just minors detail to be provide for a better understanding by non-scientific community.</p> <p>7. Up to 10 of the 18 references cited are more than 8-year-old. Authors should look for more recent articles/publications to sustain and enrich the manuscript.</p> |   |
| <p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>   | Yes, but a little bit complicated to be understand by non-specialist community (other Scientifics or non-scientific)  |   |
| <b>Optional/General</b> comments   |   |   |

### 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? | (If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details) |   |

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name:                            | <b>Nguemouo Nguegang Igor</b>                |
| Department, University & Country | <b>International Medical Corps, Cameroon</b> |