

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">European Journal of Nutrition &amp; Food Safety</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_ EJNFS_96138</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>PROXIMATE AND MINERAL COMPOSITION OF SOME FOREIGN AND LOCAL RICE VARIETIES SOLD IN MILE 3 MARKET, PORT HARCOURT, RIVERS STATE, NIGERIA</b>
Type of the 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.journalajaar.com/index.php/AJAAR/editorial-policy> )

## Review Form 1.7

### 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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>Yes, to some extent Suitable</p> <p>Abstract may be rewritten in more comprehensive manner.</p> <p>Please check the Authors guideline, should stick to the Journal's prescribed pattern.</p> <p>Yes, though presentation is not up to the mark.</p> <p>References should be rechecked. There are lot of mismatches. Some references have been deleted also. Please refer to the comments made in reviewed manuscript.</p> <p>The manuscript needs major revision. Please refer to the revised manuscript and make the corrections accordingly. Many of the portions need rewriting and restructuring.</p> <p>The introduction par may be condensed/ shortened.</p> <p>Graphs are not required as such. Instead, use Table for proximate composition.</p> <p>In Table, follow uniform pattern for putting superscript. Start the lowest as "a" and then 'b' 'c' etc. Here for different parameters you have used different patterns. Give P value for each parameter.</p> <p>The discussion part is very much stereo typed . May be rewritten in two paragraphs ( on for proximate and another for mineral composition). The statistical implications should also be reflected in discussion.</p> <p>Strictly adhere to the journal's guideline for reference. After all corrections made, recheck the references.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Correction made in the revised manuscript and some paragraphs are asked to be rewritten	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Please refer and address all the comments and corrections suggested in the body of the revised manuscript.	

### 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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anupam Chatterjee
Department, University & Country	ICAR- National Dairy Research Institute, India