

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biotechnology and Bioresource Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJB2T_96500
Title of the Manuscript:	PHYSIOCHEMICAL PROPERTIES OF DIFFERENT OIL MEDIA DURING DEEP FAT FRYING OF AKRA CHIPS.
Type of the Article	Research article

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The manuscript presents a subject of great interest to the scientific community and the general population.</li> <li>2. It may be suitable, however, there is inconsistency with the text. (Akara or Akra?)</li> <li>3. Yes, the abstract is comprehensive and it is in accordance with the text.</li> <li>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript must be reviewed carefully, as it is not standardized.</li> <li>5. The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct, however, it should be reviewed with caution as it is not standardized. Including the table and figures.</li> <li>6. References are sufficient and recent.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	The entire manuscript must be revised, regarding the writing and the standardization details, such as: sentence punctuation, equations, font size, symbols, numbers after the comma, spacing between words. In addition, the references must also be reviewed, as it is not standardized.	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	Highlighted in yellow are words, symbols and numbers that authors should pay attention to when reviewing the manuscript. The abstract has been improved with more detail (comma and word alteration).	

### 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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Roberta da Silveira</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universidade Estadual de Maringá, Brasil</b>