

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_93541
Title of the Manuscript:	Robotics Intervention in Food Processing Industries: A mini review
Type of the Article	Minireview 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:

(<https://www.journalcjast.com/index.php/CJAST/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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- The objective of this work is not declared in the abstract. 2- The abstract does not meet any standard abstract criteria in scientific articles, because it does not give an outline about what this paper is talking about neither it reaches to any conclusion nor showing any results. 3- The abstract is too long. 4- Is this the right way to cite references?. I do not see citing in brackets within the text. I do not see numbers of references. 5- This articles requires intensive rearrangement of subsections. For example in section 4, main points have to be clearly numbered on separate lines. 6- In conclusion section, the article does not state a clear and direct conclusion. Authors have to show the final outcome of their work. 7- Authors throughout their discussion, tend to use general statements especially in the abstract and conclusion sections. The flow of information is not smooth. The reader would find it difficult to understand the objective of the article. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- Are Brazil and south Africa developing countries?. Claiming that has to be supported by a reference. 2- Paragraphs are too long. 3- "4.0. South Korea, Singapore, Japan and Germany are the countries with the highest..." what do you mean by 4.0?... 4- Figure 2 is not correctly referenced in the text. 	
Optional/General comments		

[Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tamer AbuKhalil
Department, University & Country	Al-Hussein Bin Talal University, Jordan