

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_77817
Title of the Manuscript:	“ORGANOLEPTIC EVALUATION FOR ACCESSING SENSORY ATTRIBUTES OF LYCOPENE CONTAINING TOMATO PUREES AND ITS OVERALL ACCEPTABILITY”
Type of the Article	Short 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:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.9 "souse" is sauce? 2.1: It is not clear if the fresh tomato pulp is kept fresh or is canned; for T1, what does "without food additives mean"? No water is added? 2.3: What concentration did your tomato pulp get to? What was the thickness of it? Did you can it and then cook it later, or was the cooking part of the canning process? 2.4: It is not clear if you removed the seeds and skin when you dried the tomatoes. 2.4: What was the machine used to dehydrate the tomatoes? 2.5: I don't see seven as a very large number to taste test. Why did you select this number? How can you get significance with such a small sample? 2.6.1: What does "logical order to come out with the measures" mean? You brought samples out in the same order, a random order? Needs to be more specific? Results: All these tables could be combined into 1 table with mean, SD, and significance provided for each category. Providing each panellists' results is not necessary, especially for a short research article. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.10: 2017 should be in parenthesis 2.2: missing a word—"surfaces & soaked <i>up</i> all the excess water" 3.1.4: conspicuous would be more appropriately "obvious" 	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I appreciate your research premise, there isn't enough clarity in a couple areas and you have over inundated me with result material. 	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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:	<i>Karen Breshears</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>University Of Central Missouri, USA</i>