

[Review Form 3](#)

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Food Research and Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFRN_121355
Title of the Manuscript:	PROXIMATE COMPOSITION SENSORY PROPERTIES OF JUICE FROM WHOLE WATERMELON AND FRACTIONS.
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/> Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

[Review Form 3](#)

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The subject of the study falls within the objectives of obtaining food products with added value and acceptability for consumers. The objectives are common with other studies on similar topics but are interesting because they complement the knowledge in the field. The results obtained and the interpretations made by the authors provide information that can motivate the use of these products in food.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the paper is consistent with the assumed objectives.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The summary should be presented more clearly in line with the stated objectives. The introduction is too long and the information is repeated. This should be formulated much more synthetically in accordance with the assumed objectives.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure of the manuscript is properly constructed, covering the steps taken in defining the research and interpreting the results.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The objectives assumed by the authors in this research are of interest to processors even if similar studies have been disseminated for similar cases. The obtained results were interpreted statistically for a better interpretation of them and the formulation of appropriate conclusions. The analytical correlations made can give you a clear picture of the results.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references studied and used in the presentation are appropriate.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The quality of the English language used in writing the article I recommend to be improved.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

[Review Form 3](#)

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tita Ovidiu
Department, University & Country	University Lucian Blaga of Sibiu, Romania