

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Food Research and Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_AJFRN_117760
Title of the Manuscript:	Development and Organoleptic Evaluation of culinary paste prepared using Malabar Tamarind (Garcinia Cambogia)
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)
<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 manuscript is important as it highlights the pharmacological properties of Malabar tamarind which are beneficial to human health</p> <p>2. It is ok, though I suggest minor revision. It should be "Development and Organoleptic Evaluation of Malabar Tamarind (Garcinia Cambogia) Paste"</p> <p>3. The abstract has to be corrected as highlighted in the manuscript. The Author should include figures of sensory testing results to enhance understanding</p> <p>4. Subsection are ok but some subsections do not have numbers, let the author be consistent</p> <p>5. It is moderate correct but enough to provide knowledge to community</p> <p>6. They are sufficient, where possible the Author is advised to replace the older ones especially those from 2015 backwards with recent references</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language is ok, the author should incorporate the comments and remove some obvious typos in manuscript</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript focused only in sensory evaluation, the content looks too small. If possible the author can include other results obtained from the same study (if any) eg. proximate composition, nutrients or mineral determination etc</p>	

Review Form 1.7

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:	Fabian D. Mihafu
Department, University & Country	Mbeya University of Science and Technology, Tanzania