

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_99853</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>To assess the nutritional value of wheat and pearl millet-based products value added with cluster fig and beetroot</b>
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.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-policy> )

## Review Form 1.7

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the 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><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>Yes, it is. However, the following points should be noted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-The methodology, results and discussion should be coherent,</li> <li>-Starting with methodology, the sub headings do not tally with the main heading,</li> <li>- All objectives should be captured under methodology and made unambiguous,</li> <li>-First table was presented as 'Table No.1' instead of 'Table 1', corrections should be made to all tables in the manuscript.</li> <li>-The statement in column 5 of Table 1 is incomplete.</li> <li>- The following should be considered under the method of preparation of biscuits: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I. the quantity of fat and sugar added to the flours?</li> <li>II. for homogeneity, it is always advisable to mix baking soda to the dried constituents before other things (so, rearrange the procedure).</li> <li>III. be sure that the baking temperature is not a typographical error. If otherwise, then, 130°C is unrealistic.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- What insinuated the choice of selected nutrients?</li> <li>- AOAC, Kjeldhal and AAS are standard procedures, so, they are not just used for calculations as presented in the article.</li> <li>-Provide sources for the tables.</li> </ul> <p><b>Results and Discussion</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Provide reference for the choice of sensory evaluation,</li> <li>-Clearly state what T1, T2, T3, R1, R2.... stands for.</li> <li>-Rephrase the third paragraph under organoleptic properties with respect to punctuations and actual values of T2 score and control products.</li> <li>- How did you choose the control? Is it a purchased product or prepared using a generally acceptable method? Please, give reference.</li> <li>- avoid the use of i e</li> <li>-Please, input units to the values presented in all the tables.</li> </ul> <p><b>Conclusion:</b></p> <p>It is assumed that analytical precautions were taken during preparation of the products, therefore, atmospheric condition shouldn't influence the moisture contents. On what ground was the iron contents considered to be fairly good?</p> <p><b>Title:</b></p> <p>I suggest - 'nutritional values of biscuits and kachari with varying concentrations of germinated wheat flour, pearl millet flour and mung beans flour'</p> <p><b>Abstract:</b></p> <p>The abstract is not comprehensive enough. The author should try to be focused by ensuring that the abstract gives the summary of the entire research. Also, values of the results should be stated for better understanding. Was the last statement of the abstract the aim, objectives or the research findings?</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>The manuscript would have been more interesting if factorial analysis were conducted.</p> <p><b>No single reference was stated in the manuscript and most of those reference section are not recent. Also, the recommended author guidelines were not observed.</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p>	<p>Yes. However, the author should be generous with the use of punctuations for better clarity and avoid the use of haphazards in the main article. Also, the method of paragraphing is not consistent.</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Alawode, Rahmatallah Adenike</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Forestry Research Institute of Nigeria, Nigeria</b>