

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_105157
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of different pretreatments on physico-chemical properties of potato chips fried in different oils
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.journalcjust.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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <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.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The article submitted for review is indeed of an original research nature, as it is devoted to studying the influence of the production technology of one of the most popular products in the world - potato chips. In different countries of the world, different oils are used in their preparation, and the authors set themselves the task of comparing the effects achieved in each case and substantiating their advantages and disadvantages.</p> <p>The title of the article suitable</p> <p>The abstract of the article comprehensive</p> <p>Subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate</p> <p>I think that the manuscript is scientifically correct</p> <p>The references sufficient and recent</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I think that when preparing an article for publication in the CONCLUSIONS section, the authors should indicate which method of preparing chips, in their opinion, is preferable. Maybe add an economic reasoning for the conclusion.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Verkhivker Yakov
Department, University & Country	Odessa National Technology University, Ukraine