

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_103479
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Shelf Life of Wheat Flour Based Noodles Enriched with Different Levels of Eggs
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.journalcjast.com/index.php/CJAST/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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>Study is very preliminary lab experiment, however, can be considered for publishing</p> <p>Requires modification: Assessment of Shelf Life of Wheat Flour Based Noodles Enriched with Different Levels of Eggs→ Assessment Of Shelf Life Of Chicken Eggs Enriched Wheat Flour Based Noodles No No</p> <p>Requires correction</p> <p>Yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>No, whole manuscript should be checked for language by an expert for correction in the grammar, writing style and formatting details</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rewrite the whole abstract and do not add details of place of work and write the methodology in brief • Induction of fast foods culture- rewrite and use appropriate phrase • Mention aim of study in the introduction • was used for preparation of chicken eggs noodles throughout the study- delete this • Preparation of wheat flour based chicken eggs noodles- rewrite all of this section • Ciacalleus reagent- check spelling • No mention of how the noodles are packed • Whole methodology portion should be reviewed by authors • Statistical analysis portion is missing in methodology • degradation of muscle fiber protein- muscle fibre in egg? Authors should atleast write logically • Tables should have values compared by using superscript and utilization of proper test that should be mentioned in footnote along with p value that has been considered significant • All the sections in discussion require proper reasoning to be mentioned • Conclusion-“ Based on the above observations”- don't use such phrases. 	

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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Prashant Sahni
Department, University & Country	College of Dairy & Food Technology, Agriculture University, India