



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_50442
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of cooking methods and temperature on proximate and amino acid composition of breakfast sausage
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:

<http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/30/editorial-policy>



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	The reviewed article is, in my opinion, interesting, informative and is recommended for publication once changes suggested below are implemented.	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Comments:</p> <p>TITLE: corresponds to the work's content.</p> <p>ABSTRACTS: correct</p> <p>KEYWORDS: correct</p> <p>OBJECTIVES: are well-formulated and met in the article</p> <p>INTRODUCTION: correct</p> <p>MATERIAL AND METHODS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very modestly described research methodology. • Please add information if frying was with oil (what?) or without ? • It should be added information which spectrophotometer was used to determine the amino acids that reagents were used and their catalog numbers. • I would also suggest referring to the most current edition of AOAC from 2016, instead of 1990. <p>RESULTS AND DISCUSSION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The results of the research are well described. • Authors should more broadly refer to the results (value) of other researchers who have done similar experiments. <p>CONCLUSIONS: properly formed.</p> <p>REFERENCES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They are not prepared according to the editors' requirements and need to be corrected. • As much as 30.0% of sources consist of literature older than a decade, which might only be justified in the case of literature concerning the Materials and Methods section, although AOAC methods are available in 2016 edition (Official Methods of Analysis of AOAC INTERNATIONAL, 20th Edition 2016). More recent publications need to be referenced. • According to publisher's requirements identifier DOI should be given in the reference list. <p>TABLES: Tables are legible and correct.</p> <p>FIGURES: The quality of the figures should be improved, as they are illegible.</p>	
Optional/General comments		

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>



SDI Review Form 1.6

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Zuzanna Goluch
Department, University & Country	Wrocław University of Economics, Poland