

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Food Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AFSJ_96880
Title of the Manuscript:	CHARACTERISTICS OF GREEN TEA MOCCA SEAWEED TOPPING WITH TEA FLAVORS AND MOCCA
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		
<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><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>Yes, But A Short Communication</p> <p>No, But Now Modified, See Ms</p> <p>Re visit the abstract and modify for clarity</p> <p>Likely English is foreign to the author. Not withstanding good English grammar is a necessity for readability</p> <p>Poor technical content, needs review Listed references not cited</p> <p>This is a short communication, that requires clearer scientific language and presentation</p> <p>See the attachment</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English is not scholarly, presentation not comprehensive	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		
	Someone with mastery of English language should be allowed to proof read the entire manuscript	

### 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>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Agbara Gervase Ikechukwu
Department, University & Country	University of Maiduguri, Nigeria