



Journal of Food Quality and Hazards Control

Journal Website: <http://www.jfqhc.com>

Reviewing form

Article code:

Reviewer code:.....

"Quality of topic"

Originality and novelty

Excellent

Good

Fair

Poor

Comments:

"Title"

Clarity of "Title"

Excellent

Good

Fair

Poor

Comments:

Title is attractive for the reader.

Excellent

Good

Fair

Poor

Comments:

"Abstract"

The key aspects have been captured in "Abstract".

Excellent

Good

Fair

Poor

Comments:



The quality and quantity of keywords are appropriate.

Excellent Good Fair Poor

Comments:

"Introduction"

The objective(s) and literature review of the topic are clearly stated in "Introduction".

Excellent Good Fair Poor

Comments:

"Introduction" has proper length and is relevant.

Excellent Good Fair Poor

Comments:

"Material and methods"

The "Materials and methods" are ...

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Clear	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Adequate	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ethical	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Statistical analysis and tests are correct and obvious.

Excellent Good Fair Poor

Comments:



"Results"

The "Results" are...	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Clear	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Adequate	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Comprehensive	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

"Discussion"

The "Discussion" on the data is justified, compared with other similar studies.

Excellent Good Fair Poor

Comments:

The findings are explained completely and logically in "Discussion".

Excellent Good Fair Poor

Comments:

Enough similar reference and studies have been mentioned.

Excellent Good Fair Poor

Comments:

"References"

"References" are enough.

Excellent Good Fair Poor

Comments:



“References” are related to the topic.

Excellent Good Fair Poor

Comments:

Order of “References” list has been considered.

Excellent Good Fair Poor

Comments:

“References” are up to date.

Excellent Good Fair Poor

Comments:

"Tables"

The tables are satisfactory, clear, not duplicated in the text, not too many.

Excellent Good Fair Poor

Comments:

"Figures"

The figures are satisfactory, clear, necessary and not too many.

Excellent Good Fair Poor

Comments:



"Language"

The quality of scientific English language is satisfactory.

Excellent Good Fair Poor

Comments:

"Additional questions"

Are you recommending this paper is evaluated by other specialist?

Yes No

If you suggest other referees for evaluation of this paper (in your field or other fields) please introduce (name and e-mail)?

Would you be willing to review the revision of this manuscript?

Yes No

"Summary rating"

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Grammar and writing quality	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Clarity of presentation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Significance to field	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



"General recommendation"

- Merits publication either as is or subject to minor revisions as indicated below.
- Above average; publish if space is available subject to the revisions indicated below.
- May eventually be publishable, but requires major revisions as indicated below, and re-review.
- Should not be published for the reasons given below.
- Not appropriate subject matter; recommend a different journal.

Comments:

"Final decision"

Reject

Accept

Accept with major modifications

Accept with minor modifications

Comments:
