



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_33103
Title of the Manuscript:	PRODUCTION, STORAGE PROPERTIES, SENSORY PROPERTIES AND NUTRIENT CONTENTS OF DEHYDRATED TOMATO POWDER
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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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	The authors reported studies on production, storage properties, sensory properties and nutrient contents of two dehydrated tomato powder. Several studies have reported the effect of storage conditions on tomato powder. What makes this work very unique? This did not come out from the introduction. I suggest that the author should do a literature search, write out what has been done and what gap is to be filled. Furthermore, the topic is very confusing. Therefore, I suggest that the topic should be changed to effect of drying methods and storage conditions on "nutritional value and sensory properties of tomato powder" Firstly, the results are not presented in a clear and understandable manner. Secondly, there was no scientific explanations for their observations. Thirdly, there was no comparison made with previous studies. This is very important in order to position this study within the existing body of knowledge. I suggest that the authors download recent articles and compare their own findings with them and also explain if there are any, reasons for differences or variation.	
Minor REVISION comments	There should be a space between units and numbers. This should be a rule of thumb. Degree Celsius should be in capital letter. This must be corrected throughout the manuscript.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Microbial analysis procedure is a wrong title. The procedure part of this statement should be deleted, please. The same applies to Chemical analysis procedure. The word 'sensory score' in Sensory scores of dehydrated tomato should be changed to sensory evaluation Tables 1, 2, 4 and 5 have no unit. This is highly unacceptable. Please put the right unit It is not very scientific to use sample code 201 and 202. Since the samples were oven dried and sun dried. I will suggest that the authors put a column as drying methods and differentiate these two as appropriate.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Samson A. Oyeyinka</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Home Economics and Food Science, University of Ilorin, Nigeria</i>