

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Food Science Journal</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AFSJ_102247</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Diversification of Surimi-Based Processed Products (Fish Meatballs) With AdditivesTuna Fish Bone Flour</b>
Type of the 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1- The title and abstract cover the main aspects of the work and it spark interest to the right audience. Technical quality and the experiment proposed by the authors are very-well conducted and can be a good start for industrial application. The experiment was planned and conducted properly.</p> <p>2-Yes, the title of the article suitable.</p> <p>3-Yes, the abstract of the article comprehensive.</p> <p>4-Yes, subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate.</p> <p>5-Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6- Yes, the references sufficient and recent.</p>	<p>1- This paper is novel and an advancement of the field</p> <p>2- The title of the article suitable.</p> <p>3- The discussion is conducted in an interesting manner and does not raise any doubts and it gives proper recognition to similar work in this field.</p> <p>4- This paper is novel and an advancement of the field</p> <p>5- Provided was very good but the references used were inadequate and non-modern.</p> <p>6- The experiment was planned and conducted properly.</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>Yes, language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	<p>The description of the results is concise and concrete.</p> <p>The authors compared their own results with the results of other researchers.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Clarity of presentation and the language of the work are concise, logical and accurate. Present new findings, concepts and theories.</p>	<p>The manuscript provided enough details for the general reader.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Mona Abd El-Kader Mohamed Abd El-Gawad</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>National Research Centre, Egypt</b>