

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Food Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AFSJ_104444
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of Different Packaging Methods on the Storability of Cashew Nuts and Kernels
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><u>Compulsory</u> 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Revision comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript explores a topic that might be easily overlooked. The choice of food packaging materials significantly impacts the proper preservation of food and helps retain its taste and nutritional content. This research holds valuable insights for related fields. 2. The article's title effectively conveys the main theme, aiding readers' understanding. 3. The abstract is well-crafted and comprehensive. 4. The manuscript's structure is reasonable, but please ensure it conforms to the journal's formatting requirements. 5. The research methods and approach employed in the manuscript are appropriate and feasible. 6. The references are somewhat lacking. It is recommended to conduct a more thorough literature review on relevant topics and supplement the references accordingly. 	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications</p>	<p>The manuscript would benefit from appropriate proofreading and polishing, as this will enhance the reading experience for the audience.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The extent of affirmation in the research conclusions warrants critical examination, as it may be prudent to assess whether the experimental results can be extrapolated to a wider scope. Additionally, an in-depth evaluation of potential limitations within the study is imperative to ascertain their impact on the validity and generalizability of the findings. By thoroughly addressing these aspects, the manuscript's academic rigor, completeness, and value can be significantly enhanced.</p>	

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:	Rungtai Lin
Department, University & Country	Graduate School of Creative Industry Design, National Taiwan University of Arts, Taiwan