

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_97708
Title of the Manuscript:	IMPACT OF COOKING METHODS ON PROXIMATE COMPOSITION AND MECHANICAL PROPERTIES OF CHICKEN BREAST MEAT
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.journalejns.com/index.php/EJNFS/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1.- The topic addressed by the evaluated manuscript is important for the scientific community and has important practical applications, since it can lead to decision-making on the best conditions for the heat treatment applied to chicken breast meat and this has economic implications. The analysis of the proximal composition is important to fulfill this purpose. Surely the investigation must be complemented with the analysis of other physicochemical, microbiological and sensory parameters, but this will be the subject of other investigations. 2.- The title of the article is adequate and clearly reflects what was developed in the investigation. 3.- The abstract of the article is complete and understandable. It fully summarizes the details analyzed in the investigation and presents the most important conclusion of the work carried out. 4.- The work presented is well structured and responds to the international canons applied to the presentation of scientific articles. It complies with all the necessary subsections, which allows having a document of importance to the international scientific community. 5.- As I have already stated, the document is scientifically important and correct. 6.- The references presented by the authors are pertinent and updated for the subject treated in the article. It is suggested, as a recommendation, to expand the discussion a little more with other publications made in this field of knowledge.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1.- The language/English used in the article is fully suitable for the international scientific community.	
Optional/General comments	Journal guidelines should be followed	

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jose Igor Hleap Zapata
Department, University & Country	Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Colombia