

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Food Research and Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFRN_107420
Title of the Manuscript:	Development and characterization of instant nutrient dense amaranth-based composite soup for women of child bearing age
Type of the Article	Research 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> <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. Yes, the manuscript brings up important knowledge to the scientific community. The problem stated is real and the proposed solution is feasible and in terms of process and local content</p> <p>2. The title of the article is suitable and it adequately reflects the scope of the work</p> <p>3. The abstract is comprehensive enough. A minor comment for improvement of clarity has been indicated on the manuscript</p> <p>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct although there are some areas that need more clarification. These have been indicated in the manuscript</p> <p>6. The references are sufficient to support the work. There are some old references, especially those on methods but they are relevant to the current work. The discussion can be greatly enriched by including more recent citations</p> <p>With reference to the structure of the manuscript, substantial information on the rationale of the work has been placed in the Results and Discussion section. This should be moved to appropriate segments in the introduction section. This point has been highlighted in the manuscript</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The quality of the language is adequate for scholarly communications</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>There are some basic conceptual queries, particularly in the results and discussion section, which needs to be addressed by the authors in order to make the manuscript more scientifically sound. These have been indicated the manuscript</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:	Bernard Chove
Department, University & Country	School of Engineering and Technology, Sokoine University of Agriculture, Tanzania