

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_ACRI_117883
Title of the Manuscript:	CHITOSAN: A VERSATILE BIO POLYSACCHARIDE WITH POTENTIAL APPLICATIONS IN THE FOOD INDUSTRY
Type of the Article	Review 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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The article proved to be very interesting and informative about the potential of the object of this study (chitosan). It reports on the various areas of application and use of the material, as well as its promising results. I believe it will be of great value for future scientific research. 2. The title proved to be quite appropriate for what the article proposed. 3. The abstract of the article proved to be explanatory, but it could have been a little more comprehensive in terms of information. 4. The subsections of the article were placed in a well-structured and explanatory manner. 5. The article demonstrates several applications of the study product (chitosan) with their respective results and references, being considered scientifically correct. 6. The author presented very current references, with a few cases of older references, such as 2006 and 2008, but he did not reduce the quality of the material. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No spelling, grammar or language errors (technical terms) were observed when reading the article. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The text of the article is well structured in terms of sections and subsections. It appears to be very informative and referenced regarding the object of study. I just recommend that you review the older references and also review the structure of the conclusions.</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:	Geraldo Vieira de Lima Junior
Department, University & Country	Instituto Federal de Educação Ciência e Tecnologia do Sertão Pernambucano, Brazil