

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_110032
Title of the Manuscript:	QUALITY EVALUATION OF MALTED PIGEON PEA –ORANGE FLESHED SWEET POTATO FLOUR BLENDS AND BISCUITS
Type of the Article	

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript is important because we need to know the quality of the products in market. 2. The title is suitable but it does not cover what the manuscripts seeks to address clearly. I suggest the inclusion of subjects of study. "QUALITY EVALUATION OF MALTED PIGEON PEA –ORANGE FLESHED SWEET POTATO FLOUR BLENDS AND BISCUITS USING ALBINO (WISTAR) RATS" 3. The abstract is lacking the research gap hence the reason for research is not addressed in the abstract. Hence problem statement and justification of the study to be captured in the introductory section. 4. The manuscript should outline the broad objective and specific objectives clearly. Provide a section for the objectives. Where two citations are given, separate with a semicolon. Check for fed and replace with feed in the abstract. Check for typos in the manuscript. Replace words with short forms. In the methodology provide the specifications of the equipments you used some are missing including filter paper type. Provide the Albino rats' age, sex and weight in your methodology. Check the tenses used in methodology. In subsection of body weight measurement, specify the animals used in this section. Check font type in the conclusion. 5. The manuscript is scientifically correct. 6. The references are sufficient but majority are not recent. If the author cannot use recent due to lack enough research on related topic they can be maintained as they are. 7. In the conclusion, provide information relating your work with other researchers' work. If they are giving similar results or the results differ with the work of other published articles on relevant topic. 8. The hypothesis of the study is lacking. 9. Provide as section of the design of study in the methodology. 10. Ethical consideration is lacking in the manuscript 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The language quality of the articles is suitable but the typos and the tenses in the methodology to be corrected. Also check for typos in the entire manuscript. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

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:	Dennis Jack Opwoko
Department, University & Country	Mount Kenya University, Kenya