

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Food Science Journal</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AFSJ_95038</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Degradation of Milkfish Bone (Chanos- chanos Forsskal) with Pure Papain Enzyme Concentration and Heating Time</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### 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>

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<p><b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p><b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p><b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p><b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p><b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p><b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>2- The title of the article suitable.</p> <p>3- The title and abstract cover the main aspects of the work and it spark interest to the right audience.</p> <p>4- The description of the results is concise and concrete. The authors compared their own results with the results of other researchers.</p> <p>5- All the data for authors (e.g. sequence reads, code, questionnaires used) available for the readers. The language of the work is concise, logical and accurate.</p> <p>6- Provided was very good and the references used were adequate and modern.</p> <p>Language should be check and revised</p>	
<p><b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The paper easy to follow and it has a logical flow and the language of the work is concise, logical and accurate.</p>	
<p><b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments</p>	<p>Basically, this is a very deep research report, and it is excellent for the publication.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Mona Abd El- Kader Mohamed Abd El- Gawad</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>National Research Centre, Egypt</b>