

## ReviewForm1.7

JournalName:	AsianFoodScienceJournal
ManuscriptNumber:	Ms_AFSJ_102672
Titleof the Manuscript:	EFFECTOFDUCKMEATMACERATIONIN COCONUTSHELLLIQUIDSMOKEONTHEQUALITYOFDUCKMEATSAUSAGE
TypeoftheArticle	OriginalResearchArticle

### General guidelineforPeer Reviewprocess:

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. Toknowthecomplete guidelineforPeer Reviewprocess,reviewersarerequestedtovisitthislink:

(<https://www.journalafsj.com/index.php/AFSJ/editorial-policy>)

### **PART1:ReviewComments**

	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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Isthemanuscriptimportantforscientific community?</b> (Pleasewritefewsentences onthismanuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is thetitleof thearticlesuitable?</b> (If notpleasesuggestanalternativetitle)</p> <p>3. <b>Istheabstractofthearticle comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections andstructureofthemanuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Doyou thinkthemanuscript isscientificallycorrect?</b></p> <p>7. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you havesuggestion of additional references, please mention in thereviewform.</b></p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The manuscript is of importance for research and design of technologies for obtaining food products.</p> <p>The title of the paper is inconsistent with the assumed objectives.</p> <p>The abstract is formulated according to the objectives of the research.</p> <p>The structure of the manuscript is properly constructed, covering the steps taken in defining the research and interpreting the results.</p> <p>The way of organizing the study, the presentation of the methods and conditions in which the research was carried out, the bibliographic references studied as well as the way of interpreting the results are elements that would substantiate the research carried out.</p> <p>The references studied and used in the presentation are appropriate.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Need to review the language</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Follow author guidelines</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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p>	

[ReviewForm1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Tita Ovidiu</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University Lucian Blaga of Sibiu, Romania</b>