



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_44471
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECTIVENESS OF TRAINING ON FOOD PROCESSING
Type of the Article	Original research papers

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:

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



SDI Review Form 1.6

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>5: Delete second word "present" and write ... in seven villages "purposively selected" namely.....</p> <p>7: Delete "covered under the project were selected purposively"</p> <p>11: ...followed by "another" 31.73% (Note you either maintain writing (% or percent) and not the two, check through your work again)</p> <p>15: Majority of respondents (please state the percentage)</p> <p>22:gain maximum (maximally)</p> <p>26 - 27: Across the world.....and socioeconomic impact (Kindly cite an authority)</p> <p>35: technical (know – how)</p> <p>38: And packaged food (Cite authority)</p> <p>45:63.4% (Don't start a sentence with figures)</p> <p>49: Include how you got WMS</p> <p>71, 77 and 83: Interpret and add some note. What are the inference from your data, putting the data without brief notes may not be too okay</p> <p>89: delete second word "coverage"or better replace with another word</p> <p>91: It may (can) be seen</p> <p>94: nearly half of respondents (what percentage)</p> <p>106: It looks like a summary. Conclusion should not repeat findings but makes some remarks that serves as contributions to knowledge</p> <p>121: Check spelling</p> <p>122: Increase on your references</p>	As directed by the peer review, the necessary changes have been affected. Resubmitted for your perusal and advised please.
Minor REVISION comments		As above
Optional/General comments		As above

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>	The study was affected in villages however no ethical issue was discussed. Hence the author has not touched ethical issues at all and limited to the issues presented in the paper.