



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_45062
Title of the Manuscript:	Studies of the Compositional Characteristics of Commercial Roasted Beet Root Chips Snacks
Type of the Article	Original 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://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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	<p>The manuscript under review discussed the characterization of two snack products made using roasted beetroot. Although the research presented is interesting but overall document needs improvement with respect to writing and presentation of results.</p> <p>ABSTRACT: Line 7: Active substances is very broad term. Not clear relationship with present study. There is no indication of the aim of the study in the abstract. Results are spread all around without concise conclusion. Consider re-writing it.</p> <p>INTRODUCTION: The pieces of information here are not only inconsistent but highly repetitive, contains some plagiarized material also. Line 32-43: Add references. Line 95-: "The aim of this study.... (drying) on the antioxidant potential and phenolic content .. " etc. No antioxidant and phenolic content analysis is carried out and discussed in the paper. This part needs careful re-writing.</p> <p>Material and Methods: Line 145-146: This is a title of someone else's article. Line: 158-165: This must be a part of result and discussion. There is no match found between values discussed here with the one in table 2. Figure 2 is also not appropriately explained. I suggest making a compiled table or graph with a clear explanation of observed and statistical finding for total and individual sugars.</p> <p>Result and Discussion: Line 199-200: Text referred to Table 4 for physicochemical properties and detailed about wt, diameters and density, while table 4 originally is nutritional composition data of samples. The same data is in figure 4?</p> <p>Conclusion: Two different varieties of beetroot undergo the same processing and evaluation conditions, one of them was found better in sensory evaluation, unfortunately, no exciting conclusions drawn that what makes this product more acceptable than other. The comparison should</p>	<p>Aim of the study has been added in the abstract</p> <p>Proper citation has been used in the introduction section</p> <p>Corrected in the revision</p> <p>Section move to result part</p> <p>Figure has been deleted for repetition</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	be more clear and concise.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	