



I. K. Press

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Food Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAFSAT_12145
Title of the Manuscript:	ROBOTICS AUTONOMOUS SYSTEMS (RAS) IN FOOD LABORATORIES ARE THE FUTURE OF FOOD PROCESSING INDUSTRIES-A REVIEW
Type of the Article	

General guideline:

This journal believes that no manuscript should be rejected only based on 'lack of Novelty', provided the manuscript is sufficiently robust and technically sound. Too often a journal's decision to publish a paper is dominated by what the Editor/reviewer thinks is interesting and will gain greater readership - both of which are subjective judgments and lead to decisions which are frustrating and delay the publication. This journal will rigorously peer-review your submissions and publish all papers that are judged to be technically sound.

To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.ikpress.org/index.php/index/editorial-guideline>)



Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's feedback
<p>1. Is the manuscript important for the scientific community? (Please write a few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions for additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The information covered in the manuscript may be useful to the scientific community as well as food processing industries for automation. The information collected in this paper will provide the details on various components to be utilized for improving the efficiency and output of the food processing industries.</p> <p>2. Abstract need to be improve. Hence, it needs to be improved by providing the conceptual understanding.</p> <p>3. Subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. However, some corrections are required as suggested in the manuscript.</p> <p>4. Manuscript is scientifically correct</p> <p>5. References are sufficient and recent. However, the style of writing the reference is required to be corrected for some references. Volume, issue number and page numbers must be given for all the references.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Revision made</p>
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>	<p>Language of the article need little improvement for</p>	<p>Corrected all</p>



J. K. Press

1. Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	scholarly communication	
Optional comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Correct the section number as suggested in the reviewed manuscript2. Use the proper style for writing the references in the reference list. Volume and issue number are missing for many references.3. References must be written in standard format. Write the references in the style as prescribed by the journal. Also maintain the uniformity in the style of the references.4. See the comments as given in the reviewed manuscript.	Done

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>	