

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_105808
Title of the Manuscript:	Potential of Ultrasound in Food Processing: An Overview
Type of the Article	Review 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>)

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>Yes; The ultrasound techniques is emerging techniques in food processing industry to maintain the quality of products by using it</p> <p>yes</p> <p>yes</p> <p>Yes: but whatever corrections suggested kind do them properly</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>All the references were not written as per the journal guidelines, some of them are repeating in the references. Many references are used in content, missing in references. Some references are used very old.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Major corrections are in references and minor in content ➤ Overall manuscript is good 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Minor grammatical mistake found in the manuscript Corrections may require as suggested in the content</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript may be accepted by the corrections suggested in the whole content, the manuscript has described in proper way with sufficient references.</p>	

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:	Khan Chand
Department, University & Country	SAS, Nagaland University, India