

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Food Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AFSJ_101637
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of the Effect of Filtration Methods of Various Types of Adsorbents on the Quality of Coconut Shell and Kusambi Liquid Smoke as Raw Materials for Processed Meat Smoking
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> <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>1. The information covered in the manuscript may be useful to the scientific community as well as meat processing industries. The findings of the paper can be applied in the meat processing to develop new flavour.</p> <p>2. The title need to be corrected as suggested in the manuscript</p> <p>3. Abstract is comprehensive. However, it needs to be make more precise and clear.</p> <p>4. Subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. However, some corrections are required as suggested in the manuscript.</p> <p>5. Manuscript is scientifically correct</p> <p>6. References are sufficient and recent. However, the style of writing the reference is required to be corrected.</p> <p>7. Grammatical mistakes need to be rectified</p> <p>8. See the comments as given in the manuscript</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. Use the proper style for mentioning the references in the text. Number to cite the reference is missing at many places.</p> <p>2. References must be written in standard format. Write the references in the style as prescribed by the journal. Also maintain the uniformity in the style of the references.</p> <p>3. The references as given in the reference list must also be mentioned at the relevant place in the manuscript</p> <p>4. Also see the comments as provided in the main text.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	See the comments as provided in the main text.	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	P. R. Davara
Department, University & Country	College of Agricultural Engineering & Technology, Junagadh Agricultural University, India