

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Food Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AFSJ_93124
Title of the Manuscript:	Exploring the quality of dried tilapia (Oreochromis niloticus) processed using different drying methods
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>It is extremely important to avoid abbreviations in the abstract. Please, decrypt TVB-N, SD, RTD, OD and RTD when they are mentioned for the first time in the abstract.</p> <p>The aim of the study is not marked enough clearly. It would be better not to start the aim from the word "however".</p> <p>In the description of the drying methods 1 and 2, it seems important to mention the total time of the drying procedures.</p> <p>In the paragraph "Proximate Composition Analysis", describing the core of the method in few phrases will be appreciated by the readers.</p> <p>In "result and discussion", the authors did not explain why to their knowledge protein, ash and lipid content was considerably lower in smoke dried samples? Because of the higher moisture content?</p>	<p>-corrected as per reviewer comments</p> <p>-try to clarify the objectives of study</p> <p>-corrected as per reviewer comments.</p> <p>-I acknowledged the reviewer</p> <p>-possible reasons for this happening has added to the text.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	NA	
Optional/General comments	NA	

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