

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Applied Life Sciences International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JALSI_95588
Title of the Manuscript:	BREEDS VS POST-MORTEM DRESSING METHODS ON MEAT QUALITY AND MICROBIAL ASSAY OF MUTTON
Type of the Article	Research article / original 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.journaljalsi.com/index.php/JALSI/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	None	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	None	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The topic "BREEDS VS POST-MORTEM DRESSING METHODS ON MEAT QUALITY AND MICROBIAL ASSAY OF MUTTON" is an interesting study in the field. However, before accepting for publication, some point of manuscript needs to revise and make it clear for correct understanding.</p> <p>The results in the present work is believable based on the strong scientific knowledge. However, some points of the study needs to clarify by authors.</p> <p>1. What is the reason why the pH value of meat needs to determine? How is it related to other parameters in the study??</p> <p>2. For sensory evaluation, authors take this parameter for every treatment of the study? And how often for sensory assessment in the study?</p> <p>3. Check the abbreviations throughout the manuscript and introduce the abbreviation when the full word appears the first time in the abstract and the remaining for the text and then use only the abbreviation. Make a word abbreviated in the article that is repeated at least three times in the text, not all words need to be abbreviated.</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Utthapon Issara
Department, University & Country	Rajamangala University of Technology, Thailand