

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAERI_96447
Title of the Manuscript:	QUALITY AND ANTIOXIDANT ACTIVITY TEST OF PURPLE SWEET POTATO (<i>Ipomoea batatas</i> . L) FLOUR WITH SUBSTITUTION OF WHEAT FLOUR
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.journaljaeri.com/index.php/JAERI/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. The idea of the study is relevant. But the analyzes were elementary.</p> <p>2. The title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>3. The abstract is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. Subsections are not standardized. There are fixes to make. The font colors of the sections are different. Sections and subsections are not numbered.</p> <p>5. No. There are serious problems with the methods that are not clear from the text description. The author does not mention which analysis of antioxidant components or which sensory analysis test was used. He also didn't include the standard deviation in the results.</p> <p>6. No. The Introduction was all written based on just 3 authors. References are predominantly before 2015. There is only one reference from 2018 and the most recent one is from 2019.</p> <p>ADDITIONAL COMMENTS The text is not well written. The text was not prepared based on General Guidelines for Authors. Many decimal values were written with commas instead of dots. All figures replicate the data in the Tables and, therefore, it does not make sense to include them in the document.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>There are many words in a language other than English.</p>	
<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:	Roberto de Souza Gomes da Silva
Department, University & Country	School of Chemical and Food, Federal University of Rio Grande, Brazil