

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_99399
Title of the Manuscript:	PROCESSING AND ORGANOLEPTIC TEST OF SALTED ANCHOVIES IN THE FIELD AREA OF KATAPANG DOYONG PANGANDARAN
Type of the Article	Method 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.journalajfar.com/index.php/AJFAR/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>After major supplementations it could be once more considerer . And such revised paper might be interesting for the scientific community. Currently – the response is No. So, responses to question (4 – 5) are not possible, now. Weak points, requiring explanation & supplementation: <input type="checkbox"/> All conclusion are based on 'subjective' personal (consumer ?) opinions.</p> <p>But such approach and data requires strictly defines statistical analysis approach, namely: (i) who carried out tests (ii) all conditions regarding tests (iii) Number of consumer testers (it should be high enough to meet the number required for statistical analysis) (iv) brief characterization of testtters – here the question if conclusions are 'local' or 'general' can be answered (v) finally the statistically analysis of results have to be presented, with conclusions strictly recalling its results. <input type="checkbox"/> the supplementation of some 'objective' results are needed. It includes 'microbioly', at least at the minimal', supported by measurement comments regarding structure/texture...</p> <p>I can advice and support publication only after addressing above issues.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	The paper requires major revision	

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:	Sylwester J Rzoska
Department, University & Country	Insntitute of High Pressure Physics, Polish Academy of Sciences, Poland