

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Food Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AFSJ_51001
Title of the Manuscript:	CHARACTERIZATION OF PEDA PATIN JAMBAL WITH VARIOUS SALT CONCENTRATIONAS ENVIRONMENT CONTROL
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/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

SCIENCEDOMAIN international www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agree highlight that part in the manu his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	 Under 2.3 Observation Parameters: The result of testing the water content dan 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? Under 2.5 Experimentation Process: Jambal patin is carried out the process of weeding 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? 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 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? Peda patin jambal cooked and prepared for hedonic testing. What was the reference scale? (5 or 9) Please, indicate and define them appropriately Table 1 the appearance was observed no difference between 20% and 40% while differed significantly with 30% why? 	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is well written and can be published after corrections.	

PART 2:

		Author's comment (if agreed wit that part in the manuscript. It is ma feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ladislaus Manaku Kasankala
Department, University & Country	Tanzania

eed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and anuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write

with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight mandatory that authors should write his/her