#### SCIENCEDOMAIN international

www.sciencedomain.org



#### **SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_51921
Title of the Manuscript:	Physico-chemical Properties Comparison Between Released Varieties and Local Germplasm of Sapota (Manilkara Zapota)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

#### **General guideline for Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that <u>NO</u> manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '<u>lack of Novelty'</u>, 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://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/30/editorial-policy)

#### **PART 1:** Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	<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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol> <li>Abstarct and Conclusion: Authors should summarize on each objective, such as,         - for eating fresh fruit, authors would advise to choose what variety?         - for processing, authors would advise to choose what variety?         - for higher nutritional qualities, authors would advise to choose what variety?         2) Materials and Methods: There are too much contents in this section (Line 58- Line 236).         Authors should write more concise content.         3) The objective of this work (Line 56-57) This study will be conducted with the hope that this work may encourage further production, processing and marketing of sapota. But authors did not use their results to link their objective.         4) Sample collection: Authors should specify fruit age, which they use in their work.         5) Results and Discussion: Authors wrote only their results, without showing any discussion. Not writing the discussion will result in unreliable work.         6) References: There are only 11 lists, which are too few.</li> </ol>	
Minor REVISION comments	1) Line 379: Reference number 7 lack the title? 2) Line 382: Manilkara Zapota change to <i>Manilkara Zapota</i> 3) Line 383: Lack volume (issue) 4) Line 388: Achras zapora change to <i>Achras zapora</i>	
Optional/General comments	-	

#### PART 2:

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)

# SCIENCEDOMAIN international www.sciencedomain.org



## **SDI Review Form 1.6**

		<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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Benjawan Chutichudet
Department, University & Country	Mahasarakham University, Thailand

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)