

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Food Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AFSJ_103889
Title of the Manuscript:	Nutritional and Antioxidant Properties of Resistant Starch-Based Flour Blends from Unripe Plantain, Pigeon Pea and Rice-Bran
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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write 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 suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1 - This manuscript is very useful and of scientific and economic benefit.</p> <p>2 - yes.</p> <p>3 - the abstract of the article is comprehensive.</p> <p>4 – yes, they are.</p> <p>5 – I think the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6 - The number of sources is very large and is not supposed to exceed twenty-five, so I suggest reducing unnecessary sources.</p> <p>* The number of sources is very large and is not supposed to exceed twenty-five, so I suggest reducing unnecessary sources: * Kadhim, S. A., Alhous, S. F., Abas, H. M., & Hussein, H. H. (2022, November). Comparison of alpha equivalent dose and equivalent annual reproductive dose in flour/Iraq. In <i>AIP Conference Proceedings</i> (Vol. 2394, No. 1). AIP Publishing. * Alaboodi, A. S., Zgair, I. A., Kadhim, S. A., Alhous, S. F., & Kadhim, B. A. (2020, November). Estimation of the radiation hazard indices in most types of Pasta spread in the Iraqi markets. In <i>Journal of Physics: Conference Series</i> (Vol. 1660, No. 1, p. 012065). IOP Publishing.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	The language quality of the manuscript is relatively good.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	The researcher must examine the linguistic integrity of the manuscript and ensure the correctness of the grammar.	

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

Review Form 1.7

		<i>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:	Shatha Falhous
Department, University & Country	Iraq