

## 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> 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. Yes, the finding will improve the public option on the treatment of meat to have the best taste and quality. 2. Yes 3. No, in the abstract should be contained Background to see the lack up research, method, finding and conclusion. The abstract of the manuscript does not contain background. 4. Yes 5. Manuscript needs to be improved especially in the abstract, method, and conclusion. Abstract need to be improved as mentioned in no 3. Method to long may need to be simplified and conclusion to long, may need to be made shorter without mentioned result such as specificity and statistics values. 6. Yes, but still some very old references, if it is possible can be replaced with the new one at least recent 10 years.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### 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:	Sabtanti Harimurti
Department, University & Country	Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta, Indonesia