

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_97857
Title of the Manuscript:	POTENTIAL EDIBLE FILM BIOCOMPOSITE (CANNA STARCH, NANOCHITOSAN AND FISH OIL) FOR EXTEND SHELF LIFE PANGASIU SAUSAGES BASED ON ORGANOLEPTIC CHARACTERISTICS, WATER CONTENT, AND PH: A REVIEW
Type of the Article	Review 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.journalajfar.com/index.php/AJFAR/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		
<p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>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)</p>	<p>The manuscript is of interest, and the title of the manuscript is adequate with the information provided throughout it. Some minor points need to be addressed. The purpose of the article and its significance is not stated clearly in the abstract or introduction. It is important to state clearly the implications for research, practice, and society. I suggest including information regarding advantages, limitations, number of samples that could be analyzed/interval of time, costs, etc., this will increase the manuscript value. There are some considerations in the literature that can help you to improve the final version of this manuscript and were not described in the text. For this purpose, the following references may be checked: https://doi.org/10.3390/plants11192488; DOI:http://dx.doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.91218.</p> <p>Also, please replace "organoleptic" (archaic) with sensorial</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
<p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</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:	Salanta Liana Claudia
Department, University & Country	University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine, Romania