

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Food Research and Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFRN_100670
Title of the Manuscript:	DEVELOPMENT AND ORGANOLEPTIC EVALUATION OF EDIBLE BASKET USING MULTI GRAINS & NORI SHEET
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://journalajfrn.com/index.php/AJFRN/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. Food packaging or in the general terms Food Engineering is a one area in food that has been populated with artificial, unhealthy ingredients and chemical ingredient, in order to attract the market: in doing so a lot of artificial applications are put in, which has affected the health of consumers. But the production of edible basket in this work has first taken away paper use which the author talked about that with this you are assured of a healthy food.</p> <p>2. Yes</p> <p>3. The results of the organoleptic scores weren't capture well in the abstract since this work is talking about organoleptic evaluations</p> <p>4. Yes, but I expected to see a brief summary proceeding each table or figure, no discussion only results</p> <p>5. Some quotes weren't sited so it makes it difficult to prove</p> <p>6. The references are not sufficient, the references of number 7 and 8, 14 and 15, 17 to 26 are not in the body of the work. Again, some quotes are not referenced and some methodology applications are not referenced.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. Fair</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The organoleptic evaluation/ sensory evaluation processes are not detailed. Whose methodology did you use. The references quoted are not sited. The work was not discussed. The tables and figures were not summarised. The manuscript was not numbered.</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:	Prisca Nneka Onuoha
Department, University & Country	African University of Science and Technology, Nigeria