

## ReviewForm 1.7

JournalName:	<a href="#">ArchivesofCurrentResearchInternational</a>
ManuscriptNumber:	Ms_ACRI_102920
TitleoftheManuscript:	DevelopmentandStorageStabilityofCookiesfromWholeWheat,MucunaUtilis,andSweet Potato CompositeFlour
Typeofthe Article	OriginalResearch Article

### **General guidelineforPeer 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. ToknowthecompleteguidelineforPeer Reviewprocess,reviewersarerequestedtovisitthislink:

<https://www.journalacri.com/index.php/ACRI/editorial-policy>

**ReviewForm 1.7**

**PART1:ReviewComments**

	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>Isthe manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Isthe title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Isthe 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. <b>Yes, the manuscript important for scientific community but, the idea of research is not new.</b></p> <p>2. <b>Yes, the title of the article is appropriate and preferably modified to "Development and Storage Stability of Cookies from Whole Wheat, Sweet Potato, and Mucuna Utilis Composite Flour".</b></p> <p>3. <b>The abstract need to be rephrased, because the abstract should consist of the importance of the topic, then the research plan, the experiment, and the treatments, then their summary of what was obtained from the results and a recommendation of the importance of these results.</b></p> <p>4. <b>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are somewhat appropriate, but it need to be rewritten scientifically, (There are many comments in the manuscript)</b></p> <p>5. <b>The manuscript Lack of modernity of sources and the list of references should be rewritten and revised.</b></p> <p>6. <b>Tables and figures need to be reformulated and formatted.</b></p> <p>7. <b>The manuscript Lack of text quality and language integrity.</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	-	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	-	

**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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Hanan Mohamed Abdo Al-Sayed</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Ain Shams University, Egypt</b>