

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Food Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AFSJ_102065
Title of the Manuscript:	QUALITY CHANGES OF COMMON EDIBLE FRYING OILS DURING FRYING OF TRADITIONAL FOODS
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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript is important for scientific community. The manuscript determined that cooking and heating edible oils repeatedly can cause major physicochemical changes that impact their quality and stability, soybean and mustard oils were more stable than palm oil. These findings emphasise the significance of selecting and monitoring frying oils carefully to maintain food safety and quality. 2. The title of the article is suitable. 3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive. The abstract should be shortened to less than 250 words 4. Subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. 5. I think the manuscript is scientifically correct. 6. The references are sufficient and recent. Should check the error in the reference section 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 		
<p>Optional/General comments</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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Le Huy Hai
Department, University & Country	Nguyen Tat Thanh University, Vietnam