



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJEMT_7309
Title of the Manuscript:	Consumer Perception and Acceptability of Tomato-based Fruit Pulp Mixes
Type of the 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	I would recommend revising the article and only showing two or three tables and summarize other results. There are so many tables in this article that is hard to follow. Succinct written summary of findings, and use of selected important tables, should help make the article more easily to read.	It is difficult to reduce the tables to 2 or 3 as they are addressing different issues. Doing so would complicate presentation of results. However, the results are now fully discussed.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Interesting article but require some revisions.	Revisions have been carried out and highlighted.