

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Chemical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CSIJ_103334
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Analysis on the Proximate Composition of Processed Cassava Products
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.journalcsij.com/index.php/CSIJ/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>Authors have studied comparative analysis on the proximate composition of processed cassava products which may be important for scientific community. The manuscript is structured as per journal standards and well suited to scope of the journal. However following suggestions are there. Thus it is advised to do proofreading and correct the errors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Please improve the coherence in write-up ➤ The cited references in text should not be than 5 years old ➤ Author may enhance discussion part with more suitable references. ➤ Also, discussion part may be enhanced by citing following relevant studies. <p>For sensory evaluation part</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Gojiya, D., Davara, P., Gohil, V., & Dabhi, M. (2022). Process standardization for formulating protein-augmented corn-based extrudates using defatted sesame flour (DSF): Sesame oil industry waste valorization. Journal of Food Processing and Preservation, e17203. 2. Gojiya, D., & Gohil, V. (2022). Design and development of low cost sesame dehuller and its process standardization. Journal of Food Science and Technology, 59(11), 4446-4456. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</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:	Devanand K Gojiya
Department, University & Country	Junagadh Agricultural University, India