

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Food Science Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AFSJ_86387
Title of the Manuscript:	PROXIMATE AND PHYSICOCHEMICAL PROPERTIES OF JELLY PRODUCED FROM BLENDS OF BEETROOT AND PINEAPPLE JUICE
Type of the Article	Full length

### 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.journalafsj.com/index.php/AFSJ/editorial-policy>)

## Review Form 1.6

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. An original research article on the <b>PROXIMATE AND PHYSICOCHEMICAL QUALITY OF JELLY PRODUCED FROM BEETROOT AND PINEAPPLE JUICE.</b></li><li>2. <b>Objectives</b>; very concise and practicable.</li><li>3. Introduction: ok but require logical presentation for better understanding</li><li>4. <b>Materials and methods</b>:</li><li>5. Some necessary procedures in this study are hump together, avoided or providing no detail for clarity e.g. what quantity of fruits? How was the juice extracted? What aseptic procedures were adopted? etc.</li><li>6. <b>Result presentation</b>: Tables are statistically evaluated and legible. The results obtained are poorly presented. Consistently, the style is using very wordy, complex and incomplete sentences. For clarity, the Authors should consider the option of rewriting the manuscript especially with specific emphasises on logical presentation of results and discussion.</li><li>7. <b>Discussion</b>. The authors did not set to addressed fundamental questions raised by this research. Provide reasons for high/ low values and, how do this bring into line with finding by similar researchers.</li><li>8. <b>Conclusion</b>  - Conclusion: the researchers must be concise and conclude directly based on the objectives of this study. The authors are expected to avoid presentations that are complex , ambiguous, with unclear and wordy sentences  - Recommendation: This should be central on addressing the AIM of this study</li></ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Yes</li><li>2. Thank you</li><li>3. Introduction revised</li><li>4. <b>Materials and methods</b></li><li>5. Method has been clarified</li><li>6. <b>Result presentation</b>: result presentation has been revised</li><li>7. <b>Discussion reviewed</b></li><li>8. <b>Conclusion rewritten</b></li></ol>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	There are no ethical issues