

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Applied Chemistry Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJACR_48900
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of Continuous Deep Fat Frying on the Physicochemical Properties of Assorted Brands of Edible Cooking Oils So
Type of the Article	
	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that <u>NO</u> manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '<u>lack of Novelty'</u>, 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:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

Sold in Greater Metropolitan Kampala

SCIENCEDOMAIN international www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment manuscript and hig mandatory that aut
Compulsory REVISION comments	The authors should do a thorough review of the manuscript in terms of the abstract, introduction and results/discussion	
	The abstract should be reviewed and must be precise and brief to the topic. The Introduction must be reviewed to focus on the effect of the deep frying on the Physicochemical parameter rather than on deep frying and oil stability. What type of Oven was used?	
	The sentences in the whole work should be reviewed to make it easier to understand. Figures 1-4 should be removed.	
	The issue of hard and soft oil was not well explained as it appeared in the abstract, tables and then in the Figure 5. Please the discussion is far from the figures and tables.	
	The results should not be separated from the discussion (i.e. 3.0: Results and Discussion). The discussion for tables 1 should follow together with their TOTOX graph. Similar action should be done for the other tables.	
	The author should also explain the significance of the physicochemical parameters and how they are related to the quality of the Oil. These measured values should also be explain after every table. The conclusion should be summarized and include numbers (such as PV is 1.02 for example)	
Minor REVISION comments		
	A general review of the manuscript is needed to make the article acceptable to the standard of this Journal. The sentences should be reconsidered for easier understanding and the number of tables Should be reviewed.	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

		Author's comment (if agreed which have a comment of the manus of the m
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Michael Akrofi Anang
Department, University & Country	University Of Cape Coast, Ghana

ent (if agreed with reviewer, correct the highlight that part in the manuscript. It is authors should write his/her feedback here)
<i>,</i>

d with reviewer, correct the manuscript and uscript. It is mandatory that authors should write