

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Food Research and Nutrition</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJFRN_116736</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Moisture sorption isotherm and quality characteristics of sun dried kilishi stored at 45 0C</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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 REVISION comments</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The manuscript is significant as it presents a crucial foundation for further research at enhancing shelf life of meat products. Researchers can build on this knowledge to develop innovative startegies for improving the preservation and longevity of meat products. However, as highlighted in the comments below, authors are encouraged to improve and clarify specific areas to improve on the rigour of the manuscript.</li> <li>2. The word "quality" encompasses a lot of attributes which are not all covered by the manuscript (microbial quality, physicochemical quality). Perhaps if the authors rephrase to indicate the specific quality parameters covered by their manuscript.</li> <li>3. The abstract does not include a brief summary of the methodology used. This allows readers to give context to the summarised results. The results should also be summarised and only mention major highlights or findings that have a direct implication to the overall objective of the manuscript. The authors need not discuss their findings in the abstract as these are fully discussed in the results and discussion section and will unnecessarily make the abstract too verbose.</li> <li>4. The general structure and outlay of the manuscript is appropriate and easy to follow. However, the introduction seems a bit too long and redundant. Authors can summarise the literature and emphasis only significant areas. For example the explanation of the importance of proximate analysis in food products seems too general and does not really bring anything new. The result section has both results and discussion followed by another section titled discussion. What is the aim of the second "discussion" section? It seems to be another portion of literature review which does not necessarily explain anything specific to the findings of the study done. I find it redundant. Authors may need to revise the results section and only mention results in this section then discuss the results in a separate section. Alternatively, authors may combine results and discussion section and remove the other discussion section. Furthermore, the results and discussion sections needs to be further sub-sectioned to report individual components of the manuscripts findings separately to avoid confusion. For example, findings on the proximate of kilishi be discussed and exhausted before moving on to discuss lipid oxidation or sensory results.</li> <li>5. There is missing information that makes it difficult to judge the scientific correctness of the manuscript. Firstly, in the methodology there is no mention of any replication in the preparation of the kilishi. A single batch of product is not statistically sound. Authors only mention replication of the laboratory tests done on the product but not in the preparation of the product. How was the kilishi packaged and stored after preparation for the 35days? This is significant as it affects the shelf life issues being addressed in the study.</li> <li>6. The references are sufficient and recent.</li> </ol> <p><b><u>Additional suggestions/comments</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7. In the discussion section the authors say "... the protein content of this product after 35 days of storage was significantly higher (p&lt;0.05) than before storage. This might be due to loss of moisture in storage which accounted for the concentration of some nutrients such as ash and carbohydrate content as revealed in this study. The study also revealed a decrease in fat content in storage...". While this is generally correct, a more scientific interrogation of how moisture loss affects water activity of kilishi and how oxidation affects shelf life (oxidation and</li> </ol>	

**Review Form 1.7**

	<p>off flavors) is more valid as simply saying protein increased might be misleading because this is just a proportion relative to moisture amount and low fat is really an indication of oxidative processes.</p> <p>8. Authors should revise their labelling and mentioning of tables and figures to avoid confusing readers. For example the authors say "Table 2 showed the result of proximate composition of sundried kilishi before and after storage at 45 °C." but these results are in Table 5.</p> <p>9. Under the results section, authors report contradictory findings. For example in one section they say "Specifically, the protein content was found to decrease while the fat content increased, resulting in alterations to the product's texture and flavor profile" and in another they say "Protein content of this product after 35 days of storage was significantly higher (p&lt;0.05) than before storage.....The study also revealed a decrease in fat content in storage". It is difficult to follow the results and discussion.</p> <p>10. Figure 2 shows a picture of the product but there seems to be no text that links the picture and give it context. Perhaps authors would put it in the introduction section where they give a description of the product.</p> <p>11. In the conclusion the authors say "Hence, kilishi should ideally be stored in a cool, dark, and dry environment to maintain its sensory characteristics and extend its shelf life." What is the basis of this conclusion since they did not mention anything about the storage conditions of their product.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The English quality is suitable for scholarly communications. However, authors may need to make editorial changes to ensure there are no grammatical errors.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> 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:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Chido Chakanya</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>Chinhoyi University of Chinhoyi, Zimbabwe</b></p>