



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Food Science Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AFSJ_51001
Title of the Manuscript:	CHARACTERIZATION OF PEDAPATIN JAMBAL WITH VARIOUS SALT CONCENTRATIONS ENVIRONMENT CONTROL
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Under 2.3 <b>Observation Parameters</b>: The result of testing the water content and salt content compared with SNI-01-2721-2009. This statement not clear please rephrases; also the reference number used is it locally or international recognized?</li> <li><b>Under 2.5 Experimentation Process</b>: Jambal patin is carried out the process of <b>weeding</b> and cleaning the contents of the stomach then weighed the weight of the meat. Do you mean descaling which is process of removing fish scales or gutting which is process of removing fish offal?</li> <li>Jambal patin soaked in salt solution according to treatment for 24 hours with a ratio of fish and water of 1: 2. Please indicate the salt concentration treatments</li> <li>Jambal patin then dried in the sun for about 3 hours per day for 3 days. Why the drying of fish was done for only three hours in a single day?</li> <li>Peda patin jambal cooked and prepared for hedonic testing. What was the reference scale? (5 or 9) Please, indicate and define them appropriately</li> <li>Table 1 the appearance was observed no difference between 20% and 40% while differed significantly with 30% why?</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>That statement has been fixed. The reference number used is it locally recognized</li> <li>The sentence has been fixed. The process that i mean is evisceration</li> <li>Salt concentration treatment has been indicated</li> <li>Explanation has been added</li> <li>the scale used has been added</li> <li>because the average value of the appearance showed significantly different results at 30% treatment while 40% treatment experienced a decrease in average value so it was not significantly different from the 20% treatment</li> </ol>
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The manuscript is well written and can be published after corrections.	

**PART 2:**

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight
--	--------------------	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

		<i>that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></i>	