

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Food Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAFSAT_12295
Title of the Manuscript:	Physicochemical characteristics and sensory properties of spent laying hen burgers formulated with cashew pomace flour
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is important and interesting for the scientific community. It discovered the use of cashew pomace flour as a source of dietary fiber and functional ingredient in burger recipe composition.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is completely suitable	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract of the article is comprehensive.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and	This manuscript has scientific correctness. It is also scientifically robust and technically sound. It can be interesting to the scientific community.	

technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Some references aren't sufficient and recent, sources 21 and 22	
<u>Minor REVISION</u> comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Into the my opinion, the English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	From the text of the article, it is not clear why cashew puree was chosen, and not other similar raw materials. The experimental part of the article would have greatly benefited if the parameters of the water-retaining, fat-retaining, moisture-binding capacity of the developed burgers were given.	

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:	Tetiana Stepanova
Department, University & Country	Sumy National Agrarian University, Ukraine