

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Food Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AFSJ_96006
Title of the Manuscript:	Nutritional Quality and Invitro Protein Digestibility of Complementary Foods Developed from Maize, Cowpea and Orange-Fleshed Sweet Potato Flours
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.journalafsj.com/index.php/AFSJ/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. Yes, if there is going to be synergy between food industries and academic 2. Nutritional Quality and Invitro Protein Digestibility of Complementary Foods Formulated from Maize, Cowpea and Orange-Fleshed Sweet Potato Flours 3. Yes 4. Yes 5. Correct 6. Fair All the equations were not labelled or numbered All the methods were not adequately discussed. Need clarity Remove the reference authors from the body of the work All the tables were not statistically discussed. The comparison between the values as indicated were not clear that's, the power to which the values were raised did not reflect in the discussion to show the relationship or differences between those results. Is the author's style of referencing APA style?	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jeje, Oludiya Ayorinde
Department, University & Country	The Federal Polytechnic, Nigeria