

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Food Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AFSJ_98141
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF SHRIMP SHELL FLOUR SUBSTITUTION ON CROISSANT LIKING LEVEL
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:

<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)						
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. Yes, improving the nutritional value of a traditional food item and using fishery waste as food constituent provide novelty.</p> <p>2. Yes.</p> <p>3. Yes</p> <p>4. Yes.</p> <p>5. It appears correct.</p> <p>6. Yes, although the decision making process using the Bayes method is not referenced, and should be amended.</p> <p>7. The manuscript is a bit light-weight as it describes the result of only one experiment. It would be beneficial to add more substance to the ms. e.g. presenting the actual nutritional values of the croissants, proximate analysis of the shrimp flour, or assessment of the croissants using texture analyser. Presenting the organoleptic parameters one by one in separate tables is a waste of space, they should be combined into one table.</p>							
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p><b>The English language should be revised and improved in general. The manuscript contains non English words in critical positions e.g.:</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">"Table 5. Average Croissant Taste by Treatment</p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th>Perlakuan</th> <th>Median</th> <th>Rata-Rata Rasa</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Perlakuan	Median	Rata-Rata Rasa				
Perlakuan	Median	Rata-Rata Rasa						
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The italic font is used inconsistently in this ms. Why the word "croissant" was written in italic at some places? Or why the word "meaty" or "flaky" was written in italic font?</p>							

### 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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Peter Kurdi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Mahidol University International College, Thailand</b>