

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	The manuscript is more applied and has less of a scientific role. The abstract could be improved (briefly meaning and research methods, methodology, results, conclusions). The introduction is corrected, but contains citations from an outdated publication. There is no description of methods and statistical calculations. What was the data distribution (median) (mean) and please direct quartiles or SD. Superscripts exactly be a member. Any manuscript is interesting but needs new development/writing.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
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:	W Piekoszewski
Department, University & Country	Jagiellonian University, Poland