

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Food Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AFSJ_83227
Title of the Manuscript:	Determination of Hydroxyproline Amount of Fermented Sausages by HPLC and Revealing the Relationship between Quality Parameters
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The manuscript presents interesting content and is well prepared.</p> <p>The introduction contains the most important information, the material and methods are described in detail. Various analyzes have been used for qualitative assessment which adds value to the work. The results are well presented and described. The conclusions reflect the entire research and reflect the most important statements. The literature is well chosen. I have no negative comments on the manuscript.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>However, I am not satisfied with a little detailed discussion of the research results, but it does not change a very good impression about the whole work, which is prepared very well.</p> <p>I would suggest putting the keywords in alphabetical order and removing the double "breed" in the first line of the fourth introductory paragraph.</p>	
Optional/General comments	not applicable	

Review Form 1.6

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:	Dagmara Migut
Department, University & Country	University of Rzeszow, Poland