

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Food Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AFSJ_93510
Title of the Manuscript:	Typology of fermented porridges and socio-demographic characteristics of respondents in the northern part of Benin.
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:

<https://www.journalafsj.com/index.php/AFSJ/editorial-policy>

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		
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>General Comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is appreciating that the current work was designed to evaluate the endogenous knowledge of the production of fermented cereals-based porridges produced in northern benin, west Africa. 2. Adequate survey areas were covered in the study to carry out survey. 3. Interviews and occasional conversations-based data collection was relevant and appropriate. 4. Relevant statistical tools were used in the study for data collection. 5. In results part, socio demographic characteristics of the respondents were noteworthy. 6. Different porridges have been neatly represented. 7. Various methods for preserving fermented porridges have been clearly tabulated. 8. Discussion part was interpreted in the light of current knowledge. <p>Suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The current work may serve as inputs for appropriate policy making. 2. The current work have sufficient scope for entrepreneurship and food security. 3. Authors are suggested to cover some more various geographical areas for their future research work. 	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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:	Sk Chand Basha
Department, University & Country	KL (Deemed to be University), India