



I. K. Press

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Food Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAFSAT_11996
Title of the Manuscript:	Utilisation of Pineapple Waste in the Processing of Red Bean Jam
Type of the Article	

General guideline:

This journal believes that no manuscript should be rejected only based on 'lack of Novelty', provided the manuscript is sufficiently robust and technically sound. Too often a journal's decision to publish a paper is dominated by what the Editor/reviewer thinks is interesting and will gain greater readership - both of which are subjective judgments and lead to decisions which are frustrating and delay the publication. This journal will rigorously peer-review your submissions and publish all papers that are judged to be technically sound.

To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<http://www.ikpress.org/index.php/index/editorial-guideline>



1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's feedback
<p><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for the scientific community? (Please write a few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions for additional references, please mention them in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✚ The manuscript is important and mandatory topic of interest. Such types of manuscript is scientifically important for future researcher as a milestone. ✚ Definately suitable article it is. ✚ The abstract section is very nicely written and comprehensive. Only I suggest the authors to add the conclusion and recommendation section with not more than two lines. ✚ The section and subsection of the manuscript is also good. ✚ But here I suggest please cite the material and methods section. ✚ Ofcourse the manuscript is scientifically correct. ✚ Yes,the authors use the recent articles and sufficiently cited and compare the current result with the previous report. ✚ The conclusion also good but, please jotiing downlike this is un important in my point of view,so please write in paragraph form rather than listing the outcomes. 	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>OFCOURSE THE LANGUAGE QUALITY IS GOOD, PLEASE MAKE MORE SMART AND CLEAR FOR ALL READER CAN EASILY UNDERSTAND YOUR FINDING.</p>	



J. K. Press

Optional comments	Only I suggest that make it more attactives by following the journal guidelines and easily understandable ways for scientific community.	
--------------------------	--	--

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Terfo Yilma Mikre
Department, University & Country	Haramaya University, Ethiopia