

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Food Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AFSJ_89712
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF DIFFERENT FRYING METHODS ON COOKING YIELD, TENDERNESS AND SENSORY PROPERTIES OF CHICKEN BREAST MEAT
Type of the Article	Original scientific works

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:

(<https://www.journalafsj.com/index.php/AFSJ/editorial-policy>)

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		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>The purpose of this paper was to determine the effect of different frying methods on the quality of chicken breast meat by using sensorial and texture analysis. This manuscript is well-written and explains well the process by which the authors analysed, selected, and included the samples. A reproducible and easily readable format is also provided for statistical analysis, discussions, and results.</p> <p>However, while the article proves to be one of high quality, there are some minor issues related to the use of English and the punctuation that will make the manuscript suitable for publication if and when some minor corrections are made. As an introduction, I suggest that the structure of the document should be improved so that it makes more sense to the reader. It may be helpful to use different paragraphs in order to illustrate the different ideas, starting with the most general and moving on to the most specific ones: "Meat is a nutrient-rich commodity, Breast is a particular muscle, Frying foods in oils, Air-frying".</p> <p>It would be better to focus on sensory parameters rather than the effects of frying foods in oil.</p> <p>In the introduction of this article, there is a short summary of recent bibliography that is abundant in this field of technology</p> <p>It would be advisable to revise and rewrite it in a more conventional style: For example, Given et al. (2011) reported that chicken breast has a mild taste and high levels of protein.</p> <p>I would like to suggest that the word <i>judges</i> be replaced by <i>panellists</i></p> <p>It is also recommended that you specify whether the results were consistent with those reported in the literature as well as with your expectation.</p>	
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Isabela Bulai
Department, University & Country	University of Agronomic Sciences and Veterinary Medicine of Bucharest, Romania